



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

46583
44.5

46583.44.5



Harvard College Library

FROM

Cornell University
Library

426

The Rime Technique
IN THE POEMS OF
REINMAR VON ZWETER

Owing to the sudden departure of the author for China while his thesis was going through the press, he was unable to complete the revision of the proofs.

8057

THE RIME TECHNIQUE
IN THE POEMS OF
REINMAR VON ZWETER

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Cornell University
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

LOUIS E. WOLFERZ.

SEPTEMBER 1916.

X6583.X4.5



Cornell University Library



Konrad Zwierzina has made exhaustive investigations of the material of the Middle High German epic writers, the very valuable and fruitful results of which are to be found in Haupt's *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* vols. 44 and 45, entitled "Mittelhochdeutsche Studien," and also in *Abhandlungen zur germanischen Philologie Festschrift für Richard Heinzel*, Halle 1898, entitled "Beobachtungen zum Reimgebrauch Hartmanns und Wolframs." These are studies of the rimes based upon a great mass of material in the form of rime dictionaries of nearly all the Middle High German epics.

It is well known that the scribes and copyists of the ancient manuscripts had no misgivings about making changes in the text to suit their own vocabulary or dialectic usage, and these changes could easily be made without affecting the text provided the word was in the verse, but in rime such changes were much more difficult, if not impossible, because then both members of the rime pair required changing and frequently one or both of the verses needed recasting. For this reason the rimes have come down to us quite intact and furnish a more reliable criterion of the author's original diction than any of the rest of the text. A rime investigation leads us into the workshop of the author, as it were, and we observe him at his work. We note his peculiarities, his special preferences, the influence of his dialect, the development of his rime technique.

That Zwierzina's studies are based upon the rimes lends so much more weight to his conclusions. His method is to compare the rimes of two writers e.g. in the "Beobachtungen", or of two groups of writers as the Austrian-Bavarian and the Middle German in the "Studien", or of individuals in their different works, tracing throughout the use of a given word or grammatical form, e.g. the adverb *sân* which Wolfram uses 86 times in the first half of *Parzival*, an average of 1:150, is used only five times in the second half, an average of 1:2370. Zwierzina's conclusion is that Wolfram deliberately avoided it from book VIII on, because it came to his notice that his readers considered it dialectic. If several hundred opportunities to rime *gân*, *stân* with other *-ân*

forms are left unused, the conclusion is that Wolfram's forms were *gên, stên, gêt, stêt*, for both words are among the most frequently used wherever they are not purposely avoided. Other most common words are *kam, kâmen, kaeme, kaemen*. They are frequent in Hartmann but seem to have been strange to Wolfram's dialect.

Various details of rime technique such as the avoidance of doubtful or dialectic or double forms, when traced through Hartmann's epics are found to attain their highest development in Iwein and are at their lowest in *Erstes Büchlein* and *Erec*. The correctness of Lachmann's chronology of the epics of Hartmann: *Erstes Büchlein*, *Erec*, Gregorius, *Armer Heinrich*, Iwein seems thereby conclusively confirmed. The evident desire of an author—especially Hartmann in Iwein—to avoid riming doubtful or double forms, and, where such a form cannot be altogether avoided, to restrict it to use within the verse, lends considerable support to the theory that there was in Middle High German times an ideal literary language, free from all dialectic peculiarities, toward which authors strove, though they never succeeded in freeing their diction from all dialectic peculiarities. Rimes that might offend the ears of anyone using another dialect were avoided out of a desire to make the work popular with the widest possible circle of readers. Using a word in the verse avoided offense because everyone could change to suit his own tastes, but in rime it was quite inflexible. Zwierzina is enabled by the quantity of material at his disposal to distinguish between dialects in their use of certain rimes, e.g. the riming together of the different quantities and qualities of the *e*. He examines the so-called irregular and exceptional cases and establishes beyond question that they can all be explained by certain rules which he sets forth. So, too, he finds that the dialects distinguish very carefully between the old *ei* contracted from *-ege-* and the *ei* contracted from *-age-*. In other cases he is able to show that usage depends not on dialectic influence but merely on the author's personal preference.

The following rime studies are the result of an attempt to apply to the lyric writers the method which Zwierzina applies to the epic writers with such success, and were suggested by Prof. Strauch of Halle University. The great wealth of material from which Zwierzina draws his conclusions is not at hand in the lyric field and it would be most venturesome to draw equally far reaching conclusions. In material of limited extent the absence of examples may indicate nothing at all and the presence of one or two may depend wholly on chance. But even a limited number of examples can bear indications of importance, above all when they can be interpreted in the light of such well-established principles as those of Zwierzina.

In most cases, therefore, Zwierzina's results have been accepted and the examples have been interpreted by them. This course is justified by the fact that Paul and Michels have incorporated these same results in the latest editions of their Middle High German grammars. Although an investigation of this kind ought to include the whole field of lyric poetry, it has been necessary to confine these studies to a few authors only. Reinmar von Hagenau, Walther von der Vogelweide, and Reinmar von Zweter have been chosen because of the amount of material they offer and especially because their works are available in admirable critical editions. It is the purpose of these studies to investigate especially Reinmar von Zweter (RvZ) of whose poems Roethe's splendid critical edition (Leipzig 1887) furnishes a most reliable working basis. For Walther examples are cited according to Lachmann (seventh edition) prepared by C. v. Kraus, Berlin 1907, and for Reinmar von Hagenau (RvH) according to Vogt's revision of *Minnesangs Frühling* (second edition) 1914. Rime dictionaries of RvH and RvZ have been prepared and furnish the basis for the investigations. For Walther, Hornig's *Glossar*, Quedlinburg 1844, has been used.*

There are many interesting problems connected with the life and writings of RvZ. Roethe's exhaustive studies have cleared up many of them, but some still remain and perhaps always will remain unsolved. It is hoped that these studies will throw additional light from a new direction on some of these problems.

Of the author's life we know extremely little. 150,1 f. he says of himself:

von Rîne sô bin ich geborn
in Ôsterreich erwahsen, Bêheim hân ich mir erkorn

When he was born, when he went to Austria, and when he chose Bohemia as his residence, we have no precise means of telling, but the political stanzas which he has written, and which can be dated have been used as a basis of reckoning. Thus we obtain the probable time of his birth, between 1195 and 1205, by counting back from the earliest datable stanza, 125, which refers to the election of Pope Gregory IX. The style and tone of the stanza indicate that Reinmar was no mere youth in November 1227. The question as to just where along the Rhine Reinmar was born has been finally settled by Roethe who locates a family von Zeutern in a village between Heidelberg and Bruchsal (nearer Bruchsal), which exists to-day as Zeuthern. The records of the nearby monastery of Lorsch prove the existence of the family from 1313 on, but the village is much older and without doubt the

* By permission the rime dictionary of RvZ has been omitted but will appear later.

family also. Von der Hagen in his *Minnesinger*, Leipzig 1838, (HMS IV 138a) gave support to an earlier theory which made RvH and RvZ father and son, and being unable to locate a von Zweter family along the Rhine, he connected Reinmar with the Kuenring family at Zwetel in Austria. Reinmar von Hagenau, he claimed, was not from Hagenau in Alsacia, but from a place by that name along the Danube in Austria.

"in Österriche erwahsen" has been interpreted by all critics to mean that Reinmar was still a boy when he left his home by the Rhine to go to Austria, and it is difficult to read any other meaning into these words if we accept them at all. The context in which they stand, which the studies of critics have always found accurate, establishes their reliability. He accompanied his father, RvH, according to v.d.Hagen. Meyer ("Untersuchungen über das Leben Reinmars von Zweter und Bruder Wernhers," Basel 1866, page 7) thinks he was a boy or at most a youth and may have been attracted thither by the presence of the many renowned singers at Vienna. The influence of Walther is evident but Meyer does not think personal contact with the great master necessarily certain. Roethe claims he was so young that no peculiarities of his home dialect appear in his earliest poems, but that they are written in the language of the MHG classicists as it was used by Walther himself. Wilmanns (*Chronologie der Sprüche Reinmars von Zweter*, Z.f.d.A. 13,434 ff.) considers Austria the place of RvZ's first productions. We shall have occasion to examine these early poems and also to compare their language with Walther's. They ought to present especially few dialectic peculiarities and, if any, then such as point to Austria. Certainly a problem would be raised by the presence of Middle German characteristics in these early stanzas, not only in view of the above assumptions, but also because RvZ's poetry was poetry of occasion, composed for Austrian hearers whose ears would be offended by MG rimes.

From the context of his poems we gather that RvZ was a very serious-minded earnest man, inclining in certain respects almost to pedantry; that he had sincere convictions of right and wrong and gave them very plain expression, on occasion even before the Emperor or the Pope. Quite the reverse was the nature of Friederich der Streitbare, who succeeded his father Leopold VII as Duke of Austria in 1230. He had no use for RvZ's serious style and neglected and ignored him for such a writer as Neidhart. Under such conditions RvZ's position at the court of Vienna soon grew intolerable. But the opportunity for a change came in 1234 when on May 1 the wedding of Friederich's sister was celebrated with great pomp, and brought to Vienna a great company of noble guests, among them King Wenzel of Bohemia. During his stay at Vienna, Wenzel can have been approached by Reinmar with the request for a place at the court of Prague. Roethe

suggests that RvZ actually accompanied Wenzel to Bohemia when he returned home from the wedding. Wilmanns sets the date of this departure from Austria at 1236, but aside from the fact that Wenzel and Friederich were then at war, the context and order of the stanzas datable as of that period make the earlier date more probable.

Whatever hopes RvZ entertained of a happier existence at Prague than his last years at Vienna had afforded him were doomed to disappointment. The Bohemian Czechs were jealous of the favor shown the German poet and made their resentment most evident to him. He had no friend at court but the king, who was very frequently absent. The last of the political stanzas referring to Bohemia dates from the close of 1240, and RvZ must have left Prague soon after that. Nowhere does the approach of the Mongols in 1241 receive any mention and it is more than improbable that this event which caused Bohemia to tremble to its foundations would have been ignored had RvZ been in Bohemia at the time.

From his departure from Prague on, it becomes difficult to follow the author's movements. He appears at many different courts, perhaps first at Meissen and later in his own land along the Rhine principally at the court of the Archbishop of Mayence. The latest datable stanza is of 1248, but he must have lived a number of years beyond that. The date of his death is about 1260. Luppold Hornburg of Rothenburg, in a poem in praise of Reinmar says he lies buried in Essfeld in Franconia. What took him to that obscure place cannot be determined. Roethe suggests that he died there while on a journey. Although no trace of the grave is to be found, Hornburg's information is probably correct because it is coupled with the indication of Walther's burial place as at Würzburg, and this is generally accepted.

Of the many mss. in which RvZ's poems have been preserved, D, the Heidelberger ms. no. 350, and C, the Paris ms., are the most important. The bulk of the stanzas in D are 1-157 of Roethe's text, carefully arranged in groups according to subject matter, to which are added 158-193 (excepting 187) not so arranged. Ms. C is made up of an excerpt from stanzas 1-157 (but independent of D) which was later amplified from other sources. Because of this careful arrangement the order of ms. D has been followed by v.d.Hagen as well as Roethe in their editions of RvZ.

Critics from the beginning have turned their attention especially to the group of political stanzas in an endeavor to connect them with definite historical events. What v.d.Hagen undertook in his *Minnesinger* in 1838, Meyer carried forward in his "Untersuchungen" in 1866. Wilmanns, who had been working independently of Meyer on the same problem, and had found many

points in which he differed materially from him, published his results the following year in *Z.f.d.A.* 13. He arrived at the conclusion that stanzas 1-157 were gathered and carefully arranged according to subject matter by someone who had access to a very old source. Furthermore he found that the datable stanzas in the collection were in chronological order. This interesting fact, however, did not surprise him because he assumed that the historical circumstances connected with each stanza was indicated in the collector's source. Roethe's searching study in 1887, while emphasizing points of difference from Wilmanns (chiefly in dating certain stanzas) revealed again the precise chronological order of the datable stanzas in the collection, the last of which can be placed in the year 1241. He cannot accept the calm assumption of Wilmanns by which he attempts to explain this order, for there are no examples of such mss. indicating the historical circumstances surrounding the various stanzas.

The original collection "X" of RvZ's stanzas, such is his conclusion, which D copied and C excerpted; in which the stanzas are grouped so carefully in the author's own spirit, and in which the political stanzas are in exact chronological order, was made by the author himself in the winter of 1240-41. And in D this collection "X" was later augmented, perhaps after the author's death, by a second collection "Y" of 33 stanzas in no regular order. Examining the datable stanzas outside the collection "X", Roethe discovers the interesting fact that none were composed before 1241—and that they are not in chronological order—a striking support for his hypothesis that 1240-41 was the year in which RvZ himself made his collection. Accordingly RvZ's poems fall into two great divisions: those composed before 1241, and those composed after 1241. Such a collection of lyric poems, especially one made by the author himself, is unique in Middle High German literature, and causes doubt on the part of some as to the certainty of Roethe's deductions.

The principal subjects of the poems in the collection are three: God, Love and the World. Stanzas 1-22 are religious sayings, 23-55 are love poems, and 56-157, comprising two-thirds of the collection, deal with a great variety of subjects so finely welded into a continuous whole that only the author himself could have arranged their sequence. In this third group the larger divisions are 56-70 *Herrenstrophen*, 71-77 stanzas dealing with *Frau Ehre*, 78-124 moralizing stanzas dealing with personal and social virtues, 125-147 (also 148, 149) political stanzas, some in praise of benefactors, 151-157 stanzas of the last years of RvZ's stay in Bohemia. The political stanzas again may be divided into earlier and later. The following tables (Roethe p. 105, 107) give Roethe's dating of each:

125	Nov. 1227	136	1235
126	Jan.-Feb. 1228	137	Spring of 1235
127	Feb.-June 1229	138	About Aug. 15, 1235
128	Beginning of 1229	139	1235-36
129	Beginning of 1229	140	June-July 1236
130	After Aug. 28, 1230	141	Spring of 1237
131 }	1231-32	142 }	
132 }		143 }	After July 1, 1239
133 }	1231-33	144 }	
134 }		145	Aug.-Sept. 1240
135	After June 5, 1233.	146 }	End of 1240
		147 }	
<hr/>			
169	1244-45	216	Before Dec. 1246
185 }	Second Half of 1245	222 }	May 1241
228 }		221 }	
195	1246-47	223 }	1246-48
131 }	1231-32	224 }	
132 }		225 }	After 1241
213 }	1245-46	227 }	
214 }			

Thirteen in the first table can be dated independently of their order in their group; the remaining ten bear no justification within themselves for their dates, but are dated because of the context in which they are found. For other than political stanzas no precise time of origin can be set, but Roethe's attempt at a general division into such which originated in Austria, and others which were written in Bohemia, is altogether justifiable.

RvZ's Austrian period was the courtly period and his first poems were Minnelieder, hence 22-55 can be assigned to that period. His personification of Frau Ehre (for which he gained especial renown) is characteristically courtly, wherefore 71-77 are also to be placed in the Austrian period. The Herrenstrophen 56-70 are Austrian, a portion of them, (57-61, 64) according to Roethe bearing directly on R's. relation to Friederich der Streitbare. The political stanzas 125-135 are dated earlier than 1234, when R. left Austria. Besides these larger groups various individual stanzas should be placed in the Austrian period: 19, 20, 79, 81, 86, 106, 121 bear in themselves indications of Austrian origin, and there probably are others, though they do not bear Austrian marks. Outside the collection Roethe sees in 242, 251, 268 ff.(?) 330-341 Austrian stanzas.

The collection offers the chief and most interesting problems connected with RvZ, though one of the most difficult is the question of genuine and spurious stanzas. Besides the 229 genuine stanzas, Roethe includes in his edition doubtful stanzas* (230-282a) gathered from the various lyric mss., which by their style and form speak for RvZ's authorship, and other stanzas (283-329) which, though correct in form, betray their spuriousness by their style. Most of the latter are drawn from the less reliable mss. Of the doubtful stanzas Roethe suggests the genuineness of 233, 240-244, 246-248, 251-282, also 289 and 330-341. He recognizes that the material is too limited to draw from it convincing conclusions, and for the same reason these studies contribute less than had been hoped toward clearing up this important problem of genuine and spurious stanzas. But we shall have occasion to look more closely into the problem of RvZ's dialect and the poems of the different periods of his life. The Leich (L), which stands at the head of both v.d.Hagen's and Roethe's editions is accepted as genuinely Reinmar's. Roethe considers it a production of the second period, i.e. after 1241.

RIMES IN *ei*<*age*, *ege*.

Herman Fischer in his "Zur Geschichte des Mittelhoch-deutschen" (Tübingen Universitätsprogramm 1889) has made a comprehensive study of the *ei* rimes of Middle High German writers. He gathered together into a table all the *ei* rimes of 144 different authors and found that they fall into five groups: 1) those who use no *ej* (i.e. *ei*<*ege* or *age*) 2) those who use *ej* but only<*ege*, not<*age*. 3) those who use *ej*<*ege* but also *seit* and polysyllabic forms of *meit* (<*age*) 4) those who use in addition to the foregoing other *ej*<*age*. 5) those who extend their usage still further to *ein*<*egen*. The Middle German authors, he found, fall into group 2, the Alemannic into group 3, and the Bavarian-Austrian into 2, 3, and 4, but chiefly group 4.

Zwierzina (Z.f.d.A. 44,345) carried on the investigation subjecting all the epic writers to the same study and established beyond doubt the following: Middle German usage is *treit*<*treget*, *leit*<*leget*, and the polysyllabic forms of *meide* and *getreide*. Alemannic-Franconian usage is: *treit*, *leit*, and also *seit*, alongside of which latter may be rimed also the *g* form, *saget*, which does not come like *seit* from an old *segit*. For this group the contraction *ege*>*ei* is compulsory. No *egi* rimes are to be found. Bavarian-Austrian usage is: *treit*, *leit*, *seit*, *meide*, *verzeit*, *verdeit*, *gekleit*, *meit*. Not all Middle German authors conform strictly to the usage of their group. A number of East Middle German

* The numbers of and quotations from doubtful stanzas are enclosed in parentheses.

and Eastfrancian authors belong to the Bavarian group in their usage, though the number of their *seit* rimes falls noticeably short of their *leit*, *treit* rimes. Just the reverse is true of the Bavarian-Austrian group. When they rime *leit*, *treit*, alongside of their *ei*<*age* the frequency of the former falls far short of the latter.

Reinmar's usage follows: 2,3 *reinikeit* : *geseit*, 24,3 *ein leit* : *verseit*, 34, 1 *werdikeit* : *geleit*, 35,1 *werdikeit* : *leit*, 80,1 *seit* : *edelkeit*, 112,4 *trunkenheit* : *geleit*, 131,10 *seit* : *gecleit*, all in the "Sammlung" (by which the first 157 stanzas in Roethe's text are meant); 186,10 *âne leit* : *geseit*, 218,1 *meit* : *erbarmherzikeit*, 226,3 *treist* : *geist*. Of the eight other examples only one, 289,7 *heilikeite* : *sēite*, is in a stanza considered genuine, and six of the remaining seven are rimes of *meit* and occur close together. Adding all the examples in the genuine stanzas together we find five *seit*, *meit*, and four *leit*, *treit*. 131,10 *seit* : *gecleit* is a neutral rime but line 10 of the Ehrentonspruch always ends in a masculine rime. If we include the example in 289,7 we have the proportion 6:4. Such an even division of *ei*<*age* and *ei*<*ege* is characteristic of Alemannic authors. *gecleit* is characteristically Bavarian-Austrian but it is in a neutral rime and may be the *-age* form. *meit* is also Austrian but we find *magt* used alongside of *meit* three times. *seit* and *leit* are not rimed together but are carefully kept apart; however, both are rimed with old *-ei*.

While *-age* forms occur alongside of *-ei* no *-ege* forms are to be found. Is this an Alemannic characteristic? In Alemannic the contraction *-ege*>*ei* was obligatory. The rimes of old *i* with *ei* which occur in Bavarian-Austrian are not found.

Reinmar v. Hagenau's use of *ei* rimes is discussed by Fischer. The examples are: 174,10 *arebeit* : *geseit*, 191,31 *daz leit* : *seit*, 165,37 *geleit* : *werdekeit*, 184,15 *bereit* : *seit*. *treit* is not used. *-eit* rimes are 25 in number. No *-eist* or *-eite* rimes occur.

Walther's examples are: 24,15 *herzeleit* : *leit*, 25,19 *leit* : *gekleit* : *geseit*, 26,20 *geleit* : *gitikeit* : *geseit*, 29,8 *kunterfeit* : *widerseit* : *leit* (adj.), 29,32 *geleit* : *geseit* : *treit*, 97,13 *geleit* : *werdekeit*, 116,26 *treit* : *leit* (subst.).

Summing up we may say that RvZ's *ei* rimes offer no means of determining his dialect. In the same way Walther's *ei* rimes betray no dialect in particular—at least they certainly do not indicate Austrian influence: 5 *seit*, *gekleit* and 6 *leit*, *treit*—again an Alem. balance between the *ei*<*ege*, *ei*<*age* forms. In contrast with RvZ Walther binds *ei*<*age* with *ei*<*ege* two different times. Very numerous are Walther's *age* forms. Once he uses *ege* uncontracted 54,13 *legt* : *regt*. This is also in contrast with RvZ. This uncontracted *ege* speaks against any Alem. influence. 25,23 *gekleit* is characteristically Bav.-Aust.

RIMES OF THE DIFFERENT-*e* SOUNDS

Middle High German grammars distinguish between *ē* known as old *e* which was *e* in Old High German and in ancient Germanic, and *e* which is umlaut of *a*. A third kind of *e* is the so-called secondary umlaut designated by *ä* and caused by certain consonant groups which prevented the *a* from going to closed *e* and arrested it at the stage of open *e* (Paul *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik* 40a2). That the Middle High German poets distinguished between *ē* and *e* in their rimes was long ago recognized by Middle High German grammarians. Zierzina in *Z.f.d.A.* 44,249 has cleared up the many exceptions that were always cited in connection with this fact. He has clearly shown that the author's dialect and not his technique determines his usage. His investigations show that the Austrian writers distinguish with the extremest care between *ē* and *e* before *r*, *rr*, *r* plus consonant, before *l*, *ll*, *l* plus consonant, but make no distinction between *ē* and *e* before the mutes *b, d, g, t*, so that the number of pure rimes *ēbe:ēbe*, *ēge:ēge* over against the impure rimes of *ēbe:ebe*, *ēge:ege* is almost vanishing. But before liquids even in the case of difficult rime types *ē* and *e* are very carefully differentiated. *wer:mer:ber:her* rime only with each other, likewise *gēr:hēr:dēr:ēr:spēr:gewēr* only with each other; but never are the two groups combined in one rime pair. *helt:ir welt:verselt:zelt* are never rimed with the group *vellt:gezellt* etc. On the other hand *erhebet:gelēbet*, *edel:sēdel*, *engegen:sēgen*, *slegen:dēgen*, *lege:wēge* (vb.) *stete:bēte* are regular and frequent rimes.

When short and long *e* are rimed together, the Austr. always combine *ê:ē* never *ê:e*. *smēr:mēr:ēr:entwēr*, *gēr:lēr*, *enbēr:gēr* etc. *ä* and *ae* are not rimed with *ē* and *ê* respectively before any consonant except *l* in Bav.-Austr., but there seems to be some deviation on the part of a few from this principle. In Bav.-Austr. Middle High German *ê*, as well as *ē* before liquids had the open quality; *e* in the same position had the closed quality. Those writers who rimed *e* sounds of different quantities before *l* and *r* could only bind *ê:ē* never *ê:e*. In Middle German dialects *ê* had closed quality and could be rimed with *e* which likewise was closed, never with *ē*. In Bav.-Austr. and the largest part of Alemannia, *ae* had "super" open quality and could be rimed only with itself or, when quantities were mixed, with *ä* (secondary umlaut); *e* and *ē* had, both of them, a different quality from *ä*. The Middle German knew no "super" open *e*, but both *ē* and *ä* had open quality and could be rimed together as well as with *ae* which was nothing more than lengthened *ē*. Middle German authors make no difference in their rimes of *ē* or *e* whether before mute or liquid. Impure rimes are found before one as well as the other, but always only sporadically.

Turning now to the examples in Reinmar, we find them sporadic, but such as they are, interesting and important. In 18,1 we find *hêr:gêr* an Austr. rime very clearly, where we would expect a Middle German—in one of the religious stanzas which Roethe assigns to the Middle German period (p.236). In 306,4 we have an example of the combination *ê:ae—lêre:waere*, but as it is an unauthentic stanza, we must draw no conclusions from it except perhaps a further proof of spuriousness, for we would expect Middle German and not Austrian rimes outside the "Sammlung." 60,9 *durnehten:gerêhten*, 141,4 *lêben:steben* (the plural of *stap* has secondary umlaut according to Zwierzina, Z.f.d.A. 44 p.253 note 2 and Paul, MHD Gram.40a2.), 170,10. 224,10 *steben:gêben* are rimes which show that RvZ did not distinguish between *ë* and *ä*. This marks him as a Middle German writer. (313,3 *gedechte:fêchte* is a similar rime.) Stanza 141 is placed in the Bohemian period, but in stanza 60, composed in the courtly period, the rime *ä:ë* must have sounded strange to Austrian hearers, for we know that RvZ's work was "Gelegenheitspoesie". 224 is dated 1246-48 when we expect only Middle German rimes. Another Middle German characteristic is RvZ's binding of *e* and *ë* in 154,4 *gêrt:vert* (i.e. before *r* plus consonant where Austr. distinguish sharply) (308,9 *erge:bêrgen* is another example) Paul (43,a3.) cites variation between *ë* and *e* in *nest* and *swester* with seeming preference for *ë* in *nest* and *e* in *swester*. Probably both 171,3 *nest:têst* and 190,7 *swester:vester* which Roethe (p.387) calls impure are pure and not to be mentioned in this connection. Some of the rimes in which *e* and *ë*, *ê* and *ae* are separated are as follows: *e* before simple mutes is lacking. *ë* before simple mutes: L,192 *erlêgen:wêgen*, 26,10 *gegêben:lêben*, 42,10 *phlêgen:sêgen*, 142,4 *gêben:lêben*, 144,1 *gestêgen:wêgen*, 147,10 *êben:gêben*, 156,9 *geizegêbele:nêbele*, etc. Before liquids: 84,7 *welle:geselle*, 90,7 *vellet:gesellet*, 125,3 *erweln:zeln* etc., 59,10 *wern:swern*, 89,4 *widerwer:ein creftig her*, 202,1 *nern:wern* etc., 33,4 *gêlt:zêlt*, 57,4 *snêl:sinewêl* 128,3 *kêln:hêln*, 157,1 *snêl:hêl* etc. 91,7 *unwêrde:êrde*, 123,10 *hêr:gêr*, 147,3 *êr:spêr*, 202,3 *êren:gêr:êr* etc. *ë* before *ht* is rimed in 56,10. 59,1. 114,1 *knêht:rêht*, 86,1 *sêht:spêht*, 125,7 *unrêhte:knêhte*, 139,7 *rêhten:knêhten*. *ä* is not rimed anywhere but in the examples cited i.e. always with *ë*. This fact is significant.

Before nasal RvZ furnishes examples only for *e* before *n* and *ë* before *m*. Of the former there are very many L,52 *ende:ellende*, 18,9 *urstende:missewende*, 151,7 *hende:ende*, 183,9 *gebenden* (subst.):*schenden*, 208,9 *ende:gephende*, etc. The examples for the latter are 10,4. 58,3 *nêmen:zêmen*, 69,3 *nêmt:zêmt*, 146,4 *zême:deme*, 214,4 *nêmen:gezêmen*.

Walther has no examples of the above mentioned *e* rimes. The impure rimes cited by Hornig are almost all combinations with

welle which in the present has *welle* and not *wëlle* (see PBB9, 563). *jenen* has closed *e* (Paul 43,28). No examples of *e* before simple mutes can be found. *ë* before simple mutes: 3,10 *gëbe*: *widerstrëbe*, 21,37 *stëgen*:*gelëgen*, 25,26. 63,4. 72,22. 115,7 *lëbe*: *gëbe*, 92,1 *gelëgen*:*phlëgen*, 108,12 *wëge*:*phlëge*, *e* before liquids: 15,27 *helle*: *geselle*, 26,14 *bestelle*:*velle*, 51,15 *beschert*:*vert*, 61,24 *versuern*:*eruern*, 77,35 *wer*:*zer*, *ë* before liquids 16,33 *hër*:*gër*, 89,34 *gër*:*wër*, 96,19 *dër*:*ër*, 105,22 *verhëln*:*stëln*, 112,29 *engëlden*: *schëlden*.

Reinmar v. Hagenau also has no rimes of interest to us in this connection. He joins the different quantities and qualities of *e* with perfect precision. No unusual riming of *ae* occurs and *e* is in all cases separated from *ë*. Rimes between long and short *e* do not occur. Here Walther and RvH in the purity of their rimes stand together against RvZ who is less careful.

Wirnt and Gottfried rime *garwe* but Wolfram does not know the form (Z.f.d.A. 44,1). Hartmann uses it in Bûchlein, Erec, Gregorious, but not in Armer Heinrich and Iwein. *garwe* is not found in RvH, Walther or RvZ.

Gottfried knows no adverb *gar* beside *garwe*, but six times he rimes *gâr*. This peculiar distinction on his part is hard to explain. *gâr* was perhaps Alsatian just as Gottfried's *van* instead of *von* in the use of which he stands alone. RvH, Walther and RvZ use *von*. Z.f.d.A. 44,9 Zwierzina indicates the four places where RvH uses *gar* as adverb and cites also the one example of *hâr*:*gar* (160,39) which speaks for *gâr*, and possibly for RvH's Alsatian origin. This *a:â* rime is the only genuine one which Zwierzina will allow for RvH. Walther has 19 examples of *gar*, all short. It rimes with *bar*, *ðar*(6), *enwar*, *gevar*, *gewar*, *schar*(2), *spar*, *var*(2), *war*(3), *widervar*. All of these are adverbs. No *gâr* occurs. RvZ rimes *gar* L,26. 4,3. 8,4. 12,1. 12,10. 23,10. 55,4. 113,3. 118,4. 125,4. 187,1. (249,3. 266,7). Of special interest in this connection is the rime L,174 *wâr* (true): *gar*, the only rime *â:a* in the Leich. We may well seek the reason for *gâr* in RvZ. The brevity of the Leich does not warrant any far-reaching conclusion from this one rime, although it is significant. An Alsatian rime is quite impossible in RvZ unless we should wish to revive the old theory that RvH and RvZ were father and son.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN RIME

Nibl. uses no other forms of the pers. pron. beside the usual *mîn*, *mîr*, *mich*, *dîn*, *dîr*, *dich*, *sîn*, *sich* in rime except in two unusual cases where *in* is rimed with *sîn*. As an impure rime *î:i* is not permissible, Zwierzina would have *in* replaced by the genitive

1191,4 *wider sîn:sîn* and 2230,3 *gegen mîn:sîn* which is markedly dialectic in such phrases, but altogether probable (Z.f.d.A. 44,34). Like Nibl., Alphart and Gudrun also have no *ich*, *du*, *er*, *in*, *wir*, *ir* in rime. In Greg. Hartmann objects to *er* and *si* as does Gottfried in Tristan. The absence of *es* or *ez* in the rimes of all MHG authors of the XIII century was accounted for by Lachmann as being due to the resemblance of the vowel to the weak *e* of final syllables, which did not suffice for masculine rimes. Perhaps the vowel in *er* and *si* for Hartmann and Gottfried was likewise too weak to be used. Zwierzina points out the interesting fact that where *er*, *si*, *es* is not used in rime, it does occur enclitically joined to the verb. Older Lyric poetry also uses only *mîn*, *mir*, *mich*, etc. like Nibl. (Z.f.d.A. 44,43).

Of those pron. which Nibl. and the older lyric authors do not use RvH has the following: *ich* 159,10. 164,3. 168,24. 180,5. 183,10. 184,32. 193,9. *ime* 177,29. *in* (sg.) 168,7. 177,38. 192,33. *in* (pl.) 169,25. *ir* (sg.) 156,18. 173,7. 174,31. 182,30. 186,13. 186,20. 195,14. 197,10. Neither *du*, *er*, *sie* or *wir* is used. Walther has *ich* 32,3. 40,12. 40,28. 49,31. 55,35. 56,14. 57,38. 73,12. 88,33. 110,32. 122,5. *sie* (sg.) 81,35. 99,21. 117,25. *ir* (sg.) 54,15. 55,39. 99,38. 112,21. 112,31. 115,18. 119,5. 121,22. *wir* 29,22. (*ir:wir:mir*). *ir* (pl.) 29,22. *sie* (pl.) 35,19. *in* (pl.) 9,2. Walther does not use *er* and *im* in rime. *er* is not used in enclisis. *si*, *es* are frequently joined enclitically to *ich* in the verse.

RvZ has in 16,10

muoterlîchen sougte si in,
si wante ir ougen dicke an in

according to Ms. C. While the contraction of *si in* to *sîn* makes this rime possible, it is nevertheless "rührend" and in fact the only unpermitted "rührender" rime in all the stanzas of RvZ (302b, 3 *sî:sî* is in a spurious stanza). Mss. D, T have *dahin* for *in* and v.d.Hagen sets *hin*, both of which avoid the unpermitted "rührender" rime. *in* (sg.) is also used in 69,10. *in* (pl.) (250a,1. 282,7.) *er* 147,3. 202,3. *ir* (sg.) (269,7.) *ir* (pl.) 166,10. *sie* L,164 RvZ has no examples of *du*, but we find it in enclisis in the interior of the verse. *wir* does not occur. *ich*, of which we find so many examples in RvH and Walther is not used by RvZ except L,16. Why RvZ should have avoided this very common rime word is hard to explain. True he seeks always to be objective and makes only rare mention of himself, but in so many instances we observe him to be less careful in his usage than RvH or Walther. He seeks to avoid pers. pron. in rime yet twice the only examples to be found occur in the Leich: *ich* L,16 and *sie* L,164.

RÜHRENDER REIM

Rührender Reim is permitted when the identical syllables which are rimed belong to words of different stem or of different meaning. In the 13th century these rimes were not regarded by careful writers as altogether exempt from criticism or equal to regular rimes. The scribes of a later day even sought to remove them from the works they were copying. One would expect to find proper names in the most frequent and unquestioned of these rimes but examples to the contrary are numerous. Wolfr. avoids rührender Reim even with French proper names. *Gawân* is never rimed with *wân*; *Terramêr* never with *mêr*. Hartmann had less objection to such rimes but his rimes are no doubt due to special syllable division e.g. *Landô: Dî-dô* was for him *Land-ô: Dî-dô*; *Jonas: genas* was *Jon-as: ge-nas*; *Ascalôn:lôn* was *Ascal-ôn:lôn* etc. Zwierzina points out (Z.f.d.A. 45,289) that no MHG writer places the rime *Rom-aere:maere* in the class of rührende Reime.

RvH avoids all proper names not only in his rimes but even in the verse. Walther has numerous proper names but avoids all rührende Reime where such are possible, 19,26 *Engellant:hant*, 56,38 *Ungerlant:erkant*, 106,3 *Missenaere:waere*, 104,23 *Tegersê:stê*, 119,12 *Vogelweide:leide*, 82,11 *Dietrich:dich*, 21,1. 34,1 *Österrîche:gelîche*. In one case he has a triple rime in which he does not avoid a rührender Reim, 26,24 *richen:trüglichen:Friderîchen*. He avoids riming two names together except in 79,9 *Gabriêl:Raphahêl* (-êl:-hêl). With *Krist* he rimes *bist*, *frist*, *list*, but also *ist*. 119,9 *âne:Dijâne* was permissible for Walther. RvZ also avoids the rimes between proper names and identical final syllables. 136,9 *Friderîche:gelîche* 143,9 *Friderîche:sunderlîche*, L,89 *Jessê:mê*, L,160 *Arabî:drî*, 147,4 *Ungerlant:hant*, 46,9 *Êre:lêre*, where he personifies *êre*. He rimes 4,1 *Gabriêl:sêl*, but like Walther also 15,4 *Emanuêl:Gabriêl*, L,156 (and often) *Crist:ist* alongside of L,190 *Crist:bist*, 148,9 *arken:Tenemarken*, 203,9 *Honegalle:alle*. (298,7 *Sameson:Ureban* is impossible for RvZ.)

Wolfram carefully avoids permitted rührender Reim between such words as *sîn* (to be) and *sîn* (his), between *wis* (wise), and *wis*, (way, style), *danc* and *gedanc*, *teil* and *urteil* etc. though he does rime *vahen:enphahen*, *vienc:enphienc*, which were for him not permitted rührende Reime, but perfectly normal bindings. We have already seen how carefully RvH rimes, and it would be strange if we found many examples of rührender Reim in his songs. He carefully avoids *sîn:sîn* though his *sîn:mîn* or *sîn:dîn* are very frequent. Only once do we find, and there in a triple rime, 180,5 *sich:ich:ich*. An interesting occurrence indirectly connected with the preceding fact is that the "Waise" often repeats a rime word of a preceding pair or is repeated in a following rime. 153,30 *man*—153,33 *man:gewan*, 168,15 *tot*—

168,19 *tot: not*, 178,19 *mich: sprich*—178,27 *mich*, 184,36 *was*—184,39 *was: gras*, 192,16 *man*—192,18 *gewan: man*, 192,30 *wîp*—192,36 *wîp: lîp*, 197,34 *man*—197,36 *man: kan*, 199,9 *niht: geschicht*—199,14 *niht*, 199,16 *geleben*—199,18 *leben: gegeben*. Once the “Waisen” of two succeeding stanzas are identical 167,20 *wîp*—167,29 *wîp*. A number of times where the same rime is used in two succeeding stanzas, two of the four rime words are identical 152,31 *sol: wol*, 152,34 *sol: wol*; 163,29 *mîn: sîn*, 163,32 *gesîn: mîn*; 169,31 *sol: dol*, 169,37 *sol: wol*; 176,36 *mîn: sîn*, 177,5 *mîn: dîn*; 183,25 *wol: sol*, 183,28 *wol: wol*; 192,15 *guot: tuot*, 192,19 *tuot: guot*; 195,37 *lîp: wîp*, 196,6 *wîp: lîp*; 199,25 *swaere: waere*, 200,5 *swaere: waere: maere*.

Walther often plays with his rimes wherefore we must be careful not to cite examples from such stanzas as typical. The song “Reue” beginning 122,24 has 122,35 *linde: linde* in quadruple rime with 122,26 *winde: erwinde*, and 123,29 *gemeine: gemeine* in quadruple rime with 123,38 *reine: gebeine*. There are some very good reasons to doubt the authenticity of this Lied as was pointed out by Wackernagel (*Altfranzösische Lieder u. Leiche* p. 218 note). The two identical rimes do not speak of Walther’s masterful art, nor the recurrence of rührender Reim in each stanza. 30,9 *hovestaete: taete: taete*, the triple rime, involves two identical words, the only reasonably certain example. There is very little certainty as to 140,1 *sint: kint: kint*, and 167,11 *rât: stât: gât: hât: stât* both printed by Wilmanns in the Anhang of his edition of Walther. 69,1 *minne: versinne*—69,6 *minne* is an example of a “Waise” repeating a word of a preceding rime of which we saw several in RvH. In the Tageliet 89,35 *tageliet*—90,3 *schiet: tageliet* we may have another example. But the Tageliet does not represent Walther if it really was written by him. Examples of rime-pairs repeated in succeeding stanzas were cited above for RvH. Walther has also in the Tageliet, 88,12 *lieht: nieht*, 88,26 *lieht: nieht*. The grammatical irregularity of these forms among others causes many authorities to question the authenticity of the Tageliet. 118,13 *wîp: lîp*—118,22 *wîp: lîp* are in two questionable stanzas which originally may not have belonged together. Perhaps they are fragments of a lost Liet. Lachmann claimed that 27,17 ff. and 27 ff. were not Walther’s work. Wackernagel and Paul considered the stanzas doubtful and Pfeiffer excluded them. Wilmanns thinks the second stanza might be genuine. This makes the repeated rime 27,17 *frouwen: schouwen: ouwen*, 27,30 *frouwen: schouwen* very doubtful for Walther. One of the rime words is repeated in 15,34 *geschande: lande*, 16,1 *lande: sande*; 16,1 seems to be out of place in the poem in which it stands and may be a later addition and, therefore, not genuine. The “Lied” was very popular and often imitated by later writers. Wilmanns does not consider all the stanzas included by Lachmann as genuine. 34,4 ff. has in the Heidelberger Ms. five lines in the conclusion of the

stanza instead of the two printed. Wilmanns points out that the last verse has eight instead of the regular seven stresses, a metrical peculiarity very unusual to Walther. In this conclusion we find *masten:vasten*, *masten:tasten*, another example of the case in point. Thus we see that with only one exception Walther's examples for rime words repeated in succeeding stanzas are very doubtful. (Jugendlehren, 87,1 ff., of course, furnishes no examples for us in this connection.) He does not permit a rime word to repeat itself in succeeding stanzas where he is not deliberately playing with the rime. If we compare Walther with RvH in this respect we are inclined to ascribe M.F.152,25. ff. in which we have 152,31 *sol:wol*, 152,34 *sol:wol* to RvH and not to Walther.

RvZ has no examples of identical rimes in the "Sammlung", not even of the permitted kind. 16,10 *in:in* which Roethe has retained according to Ms. C, whereas Mss. D,T seek to remove it, would be unusual, not only because it stands alone, but because it is not even permitted *rührender Reim*. Outside the "Sammlung" there is one example, but of the permitted kind 174,3 *sin* (pronoun): *sin* (infinitive). In doubtful stanzas we have (250,3 *wert*(adj.): *wert*(vb.), 302b,3* *si:si*—unpermitted). RvZ has no example of a "Waise" repeating a preceding rime or repeated by a closely following rime. His examples of rimes repeated in succeeding stanzas and involving the same rime words are too numerous to be explained by coincidence even though only very common rime words are involved. There seems to be a purpose behind these many repetitions:

1. Where both rime words are used in succeeding stanzas 26,10 *geben:leben*, 27,3 *leben:geben*; 27,4. 28,4; 30,10. 31,4; 36,10 *lip:wip*, 37,1 *wip:lip*; 46,10. 47,10; 55,10. 56,3; 83,4. 84,3; 119,1. 120,1; 153,1. 154,10; 182,10. 183,1; 198,10. 199,1; 209,10. 210,1; 220,4. 221,3; (244,10. 245,1; 249,10. 250,1).

2. Where one rime word is repeated 29,10 *bi:vi*, 30,1 *si:bi*; 107,10. 108,1; 115,10. 116,3; 129,4. 130,1; 132,4. 133,3; 133,1. 134,1; 177,4. 178,1; 223,4. 224,1; (236,10. 237,1; 250b,10. 251,1; 255,4. 256,1; 290,10. 291,1). Not a few of these repetitions show the following stanza beginning with the very rime with which the preceding stanza ended. Very often the rime word (or words) is repeated in the same stanza. These examples do not include all cases of quadruple rime. In several cases the play on the rime is clearly evident: 12,1 *schar:gar*, 12,10 *gar:dar*; 37,1. 37,10 *wip:lip*; 70,4. 70,10; 102,4. 102,10; 108,4. 108,10; 121,3. 121,10; 205,5. 205,10; 210,1. 210,10.

armen : *erbarmen* is not considered objectionable by Wolfram who in many ways is painstakingly careful to avoid *rührender Reim*. RvH has no example. Walther has four—15,20. 24,35. 28,1. 73,33. RvZ 61,9. 226,9 and (260,3).

That *gelich* (gleich) and the adjective suffix *-lich* had any original connection was lost sight of by MHG authors just as it is to-day. Wolfram probably spoke *glich* and so could rime it without objection to *-lich*. Hartmann, too, must have spoken *glich* otherwise the rime *gelich* : *lich* (body) could not be explained, for *lich* (body) never rimes with adjective *-lich*. For Wolfram the same principle must have applied in *darabe* and *daran* (*drabe* : *abe*, *dran* : *an*). RvH does not use *gelich*. *gelichen* (verb) rimes with *gemellichen* (200,3). Walther rimes *gelich* only with *rich*, *lich* with *rich*, *entwich* but not with *gelich*. RvZ rimes *gelich* with *dich*, *sich*, *rich* and also 181,1 *wunderlich*; 154,7 *ungeliche* : *sumeliche*.

Hartmann and Gottfried avoid rimes between two grammatical forms in identical function whose significance is merely formal, because they were regarded as identical. Such would be, for example, *minnend ist* : *kommen ist*, *lachent an* : *sicht an* etc. Rimes between identical suffixes are also avoided. All of these would be at the same time *rührend*. When the suffix begins with a vowel, rimes between words ending in that suffix would not be regarded as *rührend* but are avoided nevertheless as identical by many careful writers. Also rimes like *schulden mîn* : *unsaeldin sîn*, though not *rührend* were also avoided because they were regarded as identical. Some writers even avoid rimes of *ie* : *nie*, *iemer* : *niemer*, *iemen* : *niemen*, *iht* : *niht* as though they were identical. Some writers who do not hesitate to employ the *rührender* Reim *gelich* : *minneclîch* object to the identical rime *lobelîch* : *minneclîch*. The triple rime *sich* : *ich* : *ich* for RvH has already been pointed out. Here we find *ich* in identical function. *mîn*, *dîn*, *sîn* are rimed together 39 times but of these thirty-six involve *sîn*, which is an infinitive thirty-four times and a pronoun only twice.

For RvH *sîn* rimed with *dîn* or *mîn* in identical function was objectionable though we do find two examples—157,22 *swaere mîn* : *saelden sîn*, 200,32 *gedachte mîn* : *vergezze sîn*. Other examples of this identical rime are—176,11 *der dienest dîn* : *diu fröide mîn*, 177,5 *daz ouge mîn* : *an daz dîn*, 179,35 *mîn unt dîn* : *frume sî mîn*. RvH does not rime identical suffixes together; in fact his rimes offer very few suffixes anyway. *arbeit* rimes with 171,5 *unstaetekeit*, 172,31 *herzeleit*, 199,8 *saelikeit*. *saelikeit* rimes with 197,29 *herzeleit*. *-heit* appears only once in rime with *leit*, 196,11. 172,27 *ie* : *nie*, 164,7. 187,28. 203,31 *iemen* : *niemen*, 166,35. 177,16 *niemer* : *iemer*, are found in RvH's rimes; but *iht* and *niht* are kept apart.

Walther uses no "form words" in identical rime. Where the same word appears twice in a rime pair (see above) it is always in different functions. 38,6 *houbet dîn* : *ougen mîn* (: *sîn* (*infn.*))

114,12 *dem herzen mîn:des willen sîn* are the only examples of *mîn, dîn, sîn* in identical function riming together. Of the twenty-five times that *sîn* is rimed, it is the infinitive twenty-two times. Only once does he permit a rime between identical suffixes—85,7 *kanzelaere:kameraere*. Grimm did not consider *-aere:-aere* a rührender Reim but never does Wolfram use it in his fifty-seven examples of *-aere*, and Hartmann uses it only once in Iw. and purposely at that. *arebeit* rimes with 10,2 *êwekeit*, 12,21 *kristenheit*, 66,34. 72,38. 92,29 *werdekeit*, 119,24 *unsenftikeit*, 122,17 *saelekeit*. *-keit* rimes with *-leit* 24,11. 44,24 *werdekeit:herzeleit*, 50,13 *saelekeit:herzeleit* and once *-schaft:-haft* 55,18 *boteschaft:tugenthafft*. *nie* and *ie*, *iemen* and *niemen* also *iht* and *nicht* are rimed together: 75,17. 95,24; 6,3. 40,11; 27,15. 106,12. 121,13. 124,3.

RvZ's rime 16,10 *in:in* has already been discussed. In the light of the following it seems all the more improbable. He offers no examples of *mîn:dîn:sîn* in identical function. He even avoids rimes between *mîn* and *dîn*. His *sîn* with two exceptions 174,3. 222,3 and (290,3) is the infinitive. It is to be noted, however, that the two places in the Leich 125,143. where *sîn* occurs it is not infinitive. Rimes of identical suffixes are —7,4 *goteheit:Cristenheit* (ms. D attempts to eliminate the rührender Reim), (236,7. *schephaere:wunderaere*). 191,9 *ewiclichen:sicherlichen* was for Reimar probably *-iclichen:-erlichen* and therefore not objectionable—(245,9 *werdlicliche:sündeclliche* where the ms. r has *werdelich:sundeclich*). *-heit* rimes with *-keit* once 208,3 *trügeheit:saelikeit*, but RvZ keeps them apart in the other twelve examples of *-heit* and twenty examples of *-keit* (found in all stanzas). Grimm claimed *-heit:-keit* is no rührender Reim, but neither Hartmann, Wolfram or Gottfried ever use it, and in RvH, Walther, RvZ we found only the single example quoted above. Zwierzina shows (Z.f.d.A. 45,303) that those writers who permit *-heit:-keit* also rime *-heit:-heit*. This seems to be borne out by the two examples from RvZ. Seven times (plus three in doubtful stanzas) *-schaft* is rimed but never with itself. Like RvH and Walther, RvZ rimes *nie* with *ie* 77,3. *iemer, iemen* are lacking. *iht* occurs only once 146,1 and is rimed that once with *nicht*.

Other examples of rührender Reim for Walther are—3,4 *driunge:einunge*, 4,34 *gebieterinne:küneginne*, 5,19 *unbewollen:wollen*: *bevollen*, 10,11 *wint:erwint*, 20,28 *entwert:gewert*, 24,15 *herzeleit:leit*, 122,26 *winde:erwinde*, 123,15 *gedingen:dingen*, 123,24 *ringen:geringen*.

For RvZ might be added the rimes L,209 *überwunden:wunden* (249,4 *zwei:enzwei*). *wart* and *bewart* are kept apart.

sân (adv.) meaning at once, thereupon, is used by Wolfram in the first half of Parzival. Hartmann used the form *sâ*. Only

one example of *sâ* in RvH 189,18 is to be found, which indicates that he knew *sâ*. Nowhere in our three authors do we find *sân*.

dēgen is a very common word in the epics, though the best writers avoided it as "unhöfisch." It is not to be expected in the lyrics with their different subject matter but its occurrence in RvZ's Leich,150—*disen jungen degen*, referring to Christ, is singular.

rich, a postpositive epithet is common in Hartmann's Erec but abandoned in Greg., aH. and Iw. Walther has one example in apposition 108,3 *got der rîche*, and RvZ has an example where he sets three modifiers after the noun—58,1 *ein hêrre junc, schoene unde rich*. Each author has several examples of *rich* as predicate attribute or governing a preceding genitive, e.g. *ist ze rîch, der ander ist rich* and *mundes rich, manger fröiden rich*. RvH does not use *rich* in rime at all.

maere as postpositive epithet is quite frequent in the first half of Parzifal, but not in the second half. Hartmann uses *maere* seldom but always as predicate attribute. *maere* as epithet was becoming obsolete by the beginning of the 13th century according to Lachmann (Nibl. 21,3). RvH uses *unmaere* as attribute but always as predicative; *maere* is always the substantive. Walther uses this epithet twice, both times predicatively: 94,24 *diu lînde maere* and 104,16 *mîn pferit maere*; elsewhere it is the substantive. *unmaere* is always used as a predicative attribute. RvZ avoids *maere* and *unmaere* in his earlier stanzas. *maere* and *unmaere* are both used as substantives and *unmaere* is also predicative attribute.

gemeit is another such epithet. RvH uses it once 203,32 as predicate attribute. Walther's one example is similarly used but rather formally 43,31 *mit zûhten sîn gemeit* (over against 44,5 *ze rehte wesen frô*). This same expression occurs in RvZ 40,4 *mit zûhten sîn gemeit*.

Wolfram was fond of using adjectives usually construed with concrete nouns, figuratively with abstract nouns in the genitive e.g. *freuden laere, aller guete laere*. The adjective *vol* is very often met with in this use. He goes very far in the creation of such constructions though he attempts to avoid overdoing it in his later works. Of our three authors RvZ shows the greatest number of examples and RvH the least. If this usage became "unhöfisch" and was gradually given up by the epic writers, we would expect the reverse order in respect to the fondness for this usage.

Even RvH has examples for *vol*—168,20 *jamers vol*, 194,18 *liebes alse vol*, but none for *laere*. Walther has 10,32 *kîusche unt übermüete laere*. Some of his numerous examples for *vol* are

—11,33 *quotes vol*, 55,21 *rehter fröiden vol*, 124,14 *ungenaden vol*. But he also has 17,29 *der wibel vol*.

RvZ L,101 *minnenbürde sünden lère* should read *sünden laere* L,131 *aller sünden laere*—here *laere* is the infinitive of the verb with syncopated *n*—a MG characteristic in the Leich. But it cannot be cited as an example of the case in point. That 90,9 *drier dinge laere* 147,7 *schandén laere* are in the “Sammlung” can hardly be constructed to mean that RvZ later gave up this use of *laere* for there are examples of analagous uses outside of the “Sammlung”. 172,5 *bûwes blöz* has figurative meaning in this stanza. *blint* is used once as predicate attribute and once 175,11 in the expression *êhren blint*. Walther uses *blint* predicately with the infinitive and *ze*—85,32 *ze merkenne blint* and 87,36 *zêren blint*; besides these two examples there are examples for *blint* as predicate adjective.

RvZ's figurative use of *vol* is frequent. A few examples are —127,1 *zornes vol*, 167,10 *quotes immer vol*, 212,3 *nîdes vol*. He also uses *bar* figuratively—21,1 *du valsches bar* which is at the same time one of Reinmar's bold substantive creations, 55,4 *aller vröuden bar*, 163,3 *quotes bar*, (249,3 *triuwen bar*, 288,3 *miner sünden bar*). Walther's one example for *bar* in rime is 6,40 *fründe bar* with concrete meaning.

gewin which usually refers to money or property is figuratively used by RvH 154,16 *ez dunket mich ein guot gewin daz ich den sin An ein sô schoene wîp verlie*, or 174,21 where it is “*ein jaermerlich gewin*” that “*swaz ich gesingen mac, Des engiht si niht daz si daz iht bestê;*” 191,19 — — — *ein man sol den sin ze staete wenden* — — — *Daz wirt im lîhte ein guot gewin*. RvZ speaks of *unser saelden hoch gewin* (but in a doubtful stanza 235,3). Walther uses the word only in its regular meaning in 20,19—

Dem einen gît er schoenen sin
dem anderen guot unt den gewin.
90,23

Wê wie jâmerlich gewin
vor mînen ougen tegelichen vert.
122,9

er gît dem einen sin
dem andern den gewin.

laz is ordinarily found predicated to *haz* and *minne*. Hartmann uses it seldom, never with the genitive. Wolfram abounds in expressions like *valsches laz*, *trurens laz*, *an freuden laz*, etc. Neither RvH nor Walther employ *laz*. RvZ has 165,4 *niht ze laz*, but in a doubtful stanza—241,1 *an den vröuden laz*. Roethe considers 241 a genuine stanza but a second and different type of the use of *laz* is represented therein.

One of the most common and conventional expressions in MHG epics and lyrics, perhaps originally related to the Virgin is—*lûter sam ein spiegelglas*—comparing virtue to a mirror. Hartmann has several examples in his earlier works but shuns the expression in Iw. Wolfram, too, rids the whole of Parzifal of it. *adamas* among other very convenient rimes to this *spiegelglas* is most frequent. Walther and RvZ avoid the expression in its most conventional form but do not break away from it altogether. In the Leich, referring to the Virgin birth, Walther has 4,10 ff.

Alsô diu sonne schînet
durch ganz geworhtez glas,
Alsô gebar diu reine Krist, diu magt unt muoter was.

RvZ has 189,2 *ein lûter spiegelglas*, which a man made out of ashes but himself was changed to ashes by his Maker.

189,8ff. nû will er (his Maker) aber ûz der selben erden
vil manegen reinen spiegel machen
der immer muoz ân ende sîn
noch lûterr dan der sünnen schîn:

seems to bear out the idea of our conventional expression.

In a stanza probably spurious, we have a typical example including the reference to the Virgin, and the rime with *adamas*, which seems to be avoided in the genuine stanzas—

287,4

Du bist der engel spiegelglas,
an tugenden vil fester dann ie fels oder adamas.

Interesting in this connection is the use of *spiegelglas* by Walther in the Lied 122,24—

Ein Meister las,
troum unde spiegelglas,
daz si zen winde
bî der staete sîn gezalt.

which Simrock took to be a reference to the “Eingang” to Wolfram’s Parzifal 1,20 ff. *zin anderhalb am glase geleichet, und des blinden troum*. That there are doubts as to the authenticity of this Lied has already been pointed out.

The preterite of *beginnen* has two forms, *began* and *begunde*. Hartmann and Wolfram vary between them in their rimes. As usual in the cases of doublets we find that Hartmann avoids both in Iwein. For the plural *begunden* there is no secondary form to cause doubt. But the past participle *begunnen* caused Hartmann uncertainty for it is to be found only in Erec. Wolfram’s form for the preterite was *begunde* though he rimes

began three times in Parzival—these seem to be literary rimes. Had *began* really been Wolfram's form, we should find it oftener in rime with the many *-an* words he uses.

Nibelungen, Gudrun and seemingly Hartmann in Gregorius (Z.f.d.A. 44,44) rime the adj. suffix *-lich* in masculine verses only in words like *lobelich*, *gremelich*, *schedelich*, *unmugelich* i.e., words of three syllables, the first two short, the third long. The first syllable bears the primary accent and a secondary accent rests on the suffix. The second syllable is always unaccented *e*. In feminine verses we find the adv. *grimmecliche*, *vroelichen*, *trüereclichen*, *vlizeclichen*, *suberlichen*, etc. Nouns ending in *-heit* are very rarely used in masc. rimes in Nibl. and Gudr. and when they are, they are also of the type indicated e.g. *gewoneheit*, *hövescheit*. They occur mostly in the verse. *arebeit* is also of this type.

RvH has *arebeit*: 158,35. 164,12. 171,5. 172,31. 174,10. 178,37. 179,21. 184,25. 187,11. 201,37 and many examples of *-ekeit*, *-eleit* with which *-eheit* could rime, but his only example is 196,11 *sicherheit*. *-lich* is not used in rime at all and is not used in the uninflected form in the verse. 203,3 we find *gelichen*: *gemellichen*.

Walther has *unhövescheit* 90,15 but also *dörperheit* 51,23 and *kristenheit* 7,3. 9,38. 12,21. 76,25. His examples of *arebeit* are quite numerous: 10,2. 12,21. 53,5. 66,34. 72,38. 92,29. 117,5. 119,24. 122,17. There is one example of *arebeite*: 103,26. His *-lich* rimes show even less correspondence with the rule in question: 7,33 *dich:genaediclich*, 54,27 *wünnenrich:gelich*. 63,37 *ungelich:rich*, 92,37 *rich:gelich*, 116,36 *mich:lobelich*, 121,7 *fröidenrich:minneclich*, 121,9 *minniclich:entwlich*. The majority of Walther's words with inflected *-liche(n)* have an antepenult fuller than unaccented *e*. Only three end in *-eliche:schedeliche*, *sumeliche*, *trugelichen*(2) while the others are much more numerous: *bescheidenliche*, *geliche(n)* (5), *miltecliche*, *sicherliche(n)* (2), *wünnecliche*, *innecliche*, *ungenaedecliche*, *lasterliche(n)* (2). Walther has 21 examples of *-ekeit* without a single example to the contrary.

RvZ has not a single example of *arebeit*, of which we noted many in RvH and Walther, except in a spurious stanza, (269,3). He seems to have avoided the word in his rimes. *goteheit* L,184. 7,4 and *trügeheit* 208,3 are three-syllabled with unaccented *e* in the second syllable according to the rule, but alongside are to be mentioned *Cristenheit* (2), *glihsenheit*, *leckerheit*, *trunkenheit*, *vorgewissenheit*; *Cristenheite*, *gotheite*, *bescheidenheite* and *hübescheite*. The rime 7,4 *goteheit:Cristenheit* shows how little RvZ was governed by the rule in question. Two words *lobelich*, *unerkenneclich* comply but (*un*)*gelich*, *wunderlich*, *unüberwunden*-

lich, jaemerlich, ritterlich, wunderlich, (wirdeclich) do not. Of words with inflected *-liche(n)* there are: *sunderliche, sündliche, lasterliche, êwiclliche(n), unbilliche, sicherlichen, minnecliche, edellichen (williclichen)* over against *sumeliche, (mugelichen, clegelichen)*. In the case of the inflected *-liche(n)* there is much closer analogy to the examples from Nibl. and Gudr. at first cited. RvZ has one example of a word in *-keit* 80,1 *edelkeit* which stands alone over against the usual *-ekeit* of which there are so many examples also in RvH and Walther.

Whether an author retains the old *ë* after *m* and *n* in short stem syllables is a question of rime technique and not of dialect (Z.f.d.A. 44, 64.)

RvH has only four examples of *-am* rimes, 161,6. 183,16. *vernarn:gram*, 165,28 *ein nam:lobesam*, 181,13 *ich nam:gezam*. There are no examples of *-ame*. RvH's masc. rimes are the rule and his feminine rimes well nigh the exception; also *-am* rimes are more easily found than *-ame* which facts point to *nam* as his form of that noun, but mss. ABCE have *name*. Still more important is the binding of *nam* with *lobesam*, the only adjective in *-sam* used in the verse or in rime in all of RvH's poems (mss. BC have *lobesame*). For him *-sam* or *-same*, *nam* or *name* must have been a doubtful point of usage and this rime his means of avoiding criticism (Z.f.d.A. 44,66).

After *a* plus nasal we find no two-syllable rimes, but after *e* and *i* plus nasal only such. 175,19 *dëme:wëme*, 185,33 *zëme:beneme* are the only rimes involving *e* plus nasal; and 177,29 *an ime:ich nime* the only rime of *i* plus nasal. These rimes are also indications of RvH's uncertainty. They stand quite alone and are neutral. *hin* or *hine* is not used, 178,36 *von:ungewon* but no *vone*.

Walther uses: 21,13 *âne scham:gram*, but 48,38 *der wîbe hōhste name:si sich schame*. If these single examples indicate anything, it is that Walther observed no rule in this regard. In verse Walther has *alsame* with no shortened *alsam* alongside of it, but we do find *-same* and *-sam*; 11,7 *gehorsam* is adj. 70,11 we also have *dëme:wëme*, 102,11 *wëme:daz es im zëme*. *hin* is used once in 79,37 *bin:hin*. *hine* is lacking. 6,34. 96,26 *von:gewon*. No *vone* is used.

RvZ uses *dan* but not *dane* 61,1 *man:dan*, 174,4 *kan:dan*, 193,4 *an:dan*, (277,3 *dan:man*). He rimes *hin* with *in* (*hīm*), *bin*, *sin*; neither *hine*, *von* or *vone* appear in rimes. 32,10 *ist zam:triuwe unt scham*, 68,3 *mit eigenlicher schame:same* (Ms.D. has *scham:sam*), 79,1 *ein hōher nam:lasterliche scham*, 111,3 *gram:lam*, 150,4 *sin lant ist sam:ich mich scham*, 210,4 *ir sūezer name:ane schame*, 217,3 *ze muoter nam:sunder scham*, (235,1 *ein sūezer*

nam: *rechte wunnesam*, 261,7 *der scham:alsam*, 290,4 *wunnesam: in einen stam*). The foregoing examples speak for *nam*, *scham* and *sam* as RvZ's forms. Neither of the two *-ame* forms are convincing as they are both neutral rimes; on the other hand the pret. *nam* is surely monosyllabic and testifies for monosyllabic *scham* (217,3): *zam* in 32,10. is uninflected adj. attrib. and establishes monosyllabic *scham*. For the Ehrenton the scheme for the third and sixth lines shows the absence of the masculine rime to be the exception (34 times in 229 stanzas). In 68,3 only Ms. C. has two-syllabled *schame*. Ms. D. has masculine rime *scham:sam*. For the fourth line also the scheme shows masculine rime (43 exceptions in 229 stanzas), so that 210,4 *name:schame* is unusual, whereas *nam:scham* would fit the scheme perfectly. Stanza 210 is found only in Ms. C. Ms. D would probably again have rendered a monosyllabic rime. 146,4 *zēme:dēme*, a single example, is two-syllabled over against which no monosyllabic use is to be found, just as with RvH and Walther.

There is variation in the use of *hërre* or *hërre* among MHG authors which Zwierzina has investigated (Z.f.d.A. 45,19). Wolfram's form is *hërre* for he rimes it only with *ërre*, *mërre* never with *vërre*, *wërre* etc. Nor does he permit *ërre* or *mërre* to rime with certainly short *e*. Gottfried's form was *hërre* although attested only once in rime with *merre*. Those authors who used *hërre*, Hartmann for example, rime it very often. Uppergermans rime *hërre* which does not exclude a doublet *hërre*. But when we find no other rime than *herre:merre*, then that author's form was *hërre*, *mërre*. *hërre* without a doublet *hërre*, says Zwierzina, is a mark of Franconian dialect. Lachmann (zu Walther 18,6) claims *hërre* as Walther's form because it is lacking in rime. The same claim might be made for RvH. RvZ's use of *hërre* (: *mërre*) in stanza 59 which Roethe places in the Austrian period arouses a question. It is the only use of *herre* in the "Sammlung", and this once is rimed with *mërre*. Whence came this MG rime in a stanza RvZ is supposed to have composed at the Vienna court probably when still under the influence of Walther, who apparently avoided *hërre*? Would not the master have chided it in his pupil's work? And then, too, we find outside the "Sammlung" where we would expect MG rimes 193,7 *hërren: vërren*, which indicates Austrian influence. Were the sequence of these rimes the reverse, we could point to it as an indication of the different periods in the author's life.

Wolfram's form for the sing. of the preterite is *begunde*. His *began* is literary. Hartmann rimes *began* twenty times and *begunde* five times in Erec. Wirnt has *began* once and *begunde* seven times.

RvH's form was *began*—158,37. 194,8. 178,33. 197,26. He has *kunde*, *gunde* but not *begunde*. Walther seems to have avoided both forms. *began* 123,16 is in the doubtful Lied "Reue." RvZ has 82 -*an* rimes but no *began*, and 12 -*unde* rimes but no *begunde*. Nine times he uses -*unden* without employing *begunden*. Only one form is to be found in all the stanzas and that is 138,9 *begunnen* the past participle.

RvH has 158,37 *began:an*, 194,8 *began:man*, 178,33. 197,26 *man:began*. Walther has only one example in a doubtful poem 123,16 *gewan:began*. His -*an* rimes, notwithstanding, are very numerous. Probably he avoided *began*. RvZ has no *began*. Nowhere do we find *begunde*. In this instance RvH stands alone over against Walther and RvZ whose usage corresponds.

A favorite rime of Hartmann in his oldest works is the perfect participle of *setzen*—*gesat*. In Iw. due to doubt concerning the doublet *gesat*—*gesetzt*, he avoids both forms. The Bav. Austr. authors generally know no form *gesat*, and it is often absent in Franc. works also.

Both RvH and Walther avoid both forms. RvZ has two examples 138,7 *wetzet: entsetzet*, 146,9 *gesetzt: ergetzet*, both in stanzas dating from the Bohemian period, not the Austrian. Walther and RvZ have not a few rimes in -*at* which would have offered a place for *gesat* had they chosen to rime it.

dagen, (a weak verb meaning to be silent, to listen in silence), and its compounds, is a word that grew obsolete in the 13th century and is avoided by Hartm. from Iw. verse 1000 on. The popular epic in Austria used it throughout. We find four examples in rime in RvH, all of them *gedagen* and close together,—162,13 *gedagen: sagen*, 163,9 *getragen: gedagen*, 165,7 *sagen:gedagen*, 169,13 *gedagen: klagen*. It is hardly safe to say that RvH uses *dagen* regularly—probably its use here depends on some special temporary influence, imitation of some model which did not influence him elsewhere. Both Walther and RvZ avoid it altogether in their numerous -*agen* rimes. For them it had probably become obsolete, while RvH still found it permissible.

pîn, one of the commonest rimes of Wolfr., is altogether missing in Hartm. The word seems to be lacking in the vocabulary of the Upper Germans. Neither RvH or Walther use it and RvZ has it only in (238,4 *schîn: pîn*), and the verb *pînen* (282a,10 —*lîp pînen: erschînen*), but both are in doubtful stanzas.

The preterites *vîe*, *hîe* occur often in the rimes in Hartm's. Er. and Greg., but are carefully avoided in aH. and Iw. where

vienc, *hienc* are rimed only with *gienc*. In his later works Hartm. chose the form with guttural and avoided the other. In the present and in the past participle the forms of *vervân* only are used without guttural. (s. Kraus, Festschrift für Heinzel p.161): 3rd sing. pres. *vervât*, p.p. *vervân*; but not 3rd sg. pres. *vât*, *enphât*, or p.p. *gevân*, *bevân*, only *vâhet*, *enphâhet*, *gevângen* etc. with guttural. In the earlier works of Hartm. we do find *enphâhen* (inf.) alongside of *enphân* and *enphienc*—*enphie*, *enphâhet*—*enphât*, but the forms without guttural were later abandoned except the inf. *enphân*. In aH. and Iw. Hartm. altogether avoids using *vervân*, which he treated differently from the other compounds of *vâhen*, probably because he did not know which form to give it. The inf. of other compounds is always used with the guttural—*vâhen*, *bevâhen*, *umbevâhen*, *gevâhen* etc. not *vân* etc.; only—*vângen* etc. in the p.p., not *vân*. The forms *vân*, *vie* without guttural are Uppergerman and are generally absent in Rhine-franconian; but some authors contract -âhen to -ân so that they have *vân* forms, though these must be regarded as different from the Uppergerman -ân (the form without guttural). Some of the forms allowing of contraction are *versmâhen*, *gâhen*, *vâhen*. When a Rhinefranconian author rimes *vân*, but not *vie*, then his *vân* is contracted and not the form without guttural.

Wolfram has in the pret. only *gienc*, *vienc* and *liez* which he separates from old -ie; in the inf. he has *vâhen*, *enphâhen*; the 3rd sg. is always umlauted—*vaehet*.

RvH uses both *vervâhen* and *vervân* in the inf. as attested by the rimes 160,27. 187,23 *nâhen* : *vervâhen*, 171,15 *hân* : *vervân*. In addition he has 201,30 *enphân*:*hân*. He uses *gâhen* in the uncontracted form 170,1 *gâhen*: *nâhen*. In the 3rd sg. pres. he uses the form without guttural, 194,34 *rât*: *vervât*. For the pret. his form is -ie for *gie* and *lie*, which are joined unhesitatingly to old -ie, as well as for *vie* and its compounds. 154,15 *verlie*: *enphie*, 155,6 *lie*: *nie*, 155,9 *ie*:*gie*, 156,16 *die*:*lie*, 171,36 *begie*: *wie*, 172,28 *niet*:*zergie*, 172,38 *nie*:*gevie*, 176,38 *nie*:*gie*, 182,32 *ergie*:*vie*. This binding of old -ie with *gie*, *lie*, *vie* etc. shows that *vervân* is the form without guttural of the Uppergermans rather than the contracted form of the Rhinefranconians. Also *gâhen* is used in the uncontracted form although the -ân rimes are easier and more frequent. RvH uses no p.p. form.

If RvH knew and used both forms, Walther was very careful to avoid throughout his numerous -ân rimes, among which the absence of *vân* forms is noticeable, all forms of the inf. without guttural. He has 60,4 *unnâhen*:*versmâhen*, 119,30 *gâhen*:*umbevâhen*. In the pret., however, his form was *vie*. Both *gie* and *lie* as well as *vie* are rimed with old -ie. No -ienc rimes occur. 5,33. 16,27 *begie*: *hie*, 11,18 *gie*:*ie*, 19,32 *gie*:*knie*, 36,27 *nie*:*umbevie*, 100,34 *hie*:*lie*.

Walther's five examples of the perf. partic. are all *enpfangen* rimed with 25,28 *begangen*, 28,12 *belangen*, 32,17 *wangen*, 39,20 *gegangen*, 110,2 *zergangen*. Three of these again are neutral rimes with *gangen*, but the other two establish with certainty the form with guttural.

RvZ has three examples which speak for the pret. form without guttural but they are strangely close together in his religious stanzas 16,4 *umbevie:nie*, 18,4 *hie:enphie*, 20,4 *knie:biegie*. In all his other stanzas all pret. forms are carefully avoided, and nowhere do we find any *-ienc* forms, so that the natural conclusion is, that these three forms indicate a temporary heedlessness in allowing forms of which he was doubtful to slip into his rimes. Roethe points out that RvZ grew much less careful in his later MG years, and he places these religious stanzas in a later period. On the other hand each of these examples is rimed with old *-ie*, an Upper-german characteristic in MG stanzas. This raises the question: should these religious stanzas be placed earlier? Wolfr. and Hartm. often use rimes in their earliest versés which they later abandoned when their riming became more certain. Two examples of the p.p. in *-angen* are found close together at the beginning 27,7 *durchgangen:gevangen*, 29,7 *enphangen:zergangen*. Also two in spurious stanzas likewise close together (311,3. *verlangen:umbehangen*, 313,1. *gefangen:belangen*.) (Mss.C.s. have *enphangen* for *gevangen*). Both rimes are neutral, which usually indicates doubt on the part of the author and permits of no definite conclusions. Since these early stanzas contain the only examples, RvZ probably decided against both forms later. For the infin. there are examples of forms with and without the guttural, but none in his earlier poems. 179,1 *lân:vân*, 204,9 *gevâhen* (inf.):*sâhen*, 216,9 *enphâhen:ergâhen*, (247,7 *vâhen:umbevâhen* 266,10 *versmâhen:hâhen*), 3rd.sg. with guttural: 6,3 *traht:übervaht*

That MG authors only use the adv. *uf* with short *u* was pointed out by Weinhold, (Mhd Gram.122), where he gives as one example RvZ 62,10 *uf:huf* (Roethe has left *uf* with long *u*). The rime is then a certain indication of MG influence—contrary to expectations so early in the "Samlung," where the stanzas should show Austrian influence. RvZ also belongs to those MG authors, mentioned by Zwierzina (Z.f.d.A. 45,64) who rime *uo* with short *u* and not long *u*: 82,3 *sun:tuon*, also early in the "Sammlung" and 215,3 *tuont:verwunt*. We find no similar examples in RvH or Walther. Here we find again a MG characteristic in a stanza expressly dated by Roethe as of the Austr. period. This and the several other examples already noted raise a question and call for an explanation. Why should we find them in stanzas composed at Vienna for Austrian hearers?

Most writers use the prep. adv. *in* with short *i* only, as Hartm. and Rud. v.Ems do. This *in* is certain for these writers because they permit rimes of *i:i* only very rarely and then usually before *ch*, where *i* is shortened to *i*, and because *in* is always rimed with certainly short *i*. But Wolfram uses only *in* as do the Franconians, Rheinländer and also Gottfried. A few careful writers of the 13th century vary between *in* and *in*. RvH has *in* 171,38 *in:min*, *in*: 191,21 *bin:in*. As he is very careful not to mix quantities not even *i* and *i* before *ch* we must claim for RvH a place among those careful writers of the 13th century who vary between *in* and *in*. Walther's examples have already been cited in Z.f.d.A. 45, 73, and are all for short *in*. RvZ rimes *in* and each time with *-in* 71,10 *gebietærin:in*, 116,1 *saelic sin: gehûst in*, (299,3 *dar in:schrin*). This would indicate certain *in*, were it not for the rimes 84,1 *zin:sin*, 180,1 *bin:schin*, (253,3 *gewin:suenærin*) whereby we see that RvZ mixed the quantities of *i* before *n* as well as before *ch*, possibly even before *t* (49,1 *sit:quit*). Ms. C has 84,1 *silberschin:sin*, but leaves 180,1 unchanged. His *-in* rimes are three times as numerous as his *-in* rimes, so that he may have found it difficult to rime *in*.

All writers who have the feminine suffix *-in* or *-in* also have in their rimes alongside of it *an-inne*. Herbort has only *-inne*, no *-in*. Some writers, chiefly Alem. and Franc. have *-in* and not *-in* beside *-inne*. Two Austrians have *-in* and *-inne*. Other writers vary between *-in* and *-in* among them Wolfr. and Hartm. That RvH should furnish only one example 181,14 *mîn:bilgerin* of fem. suffix *-in*, among all his *-in* and *-in* rimes indicates that he must have avoided the rime. Perhaps he was not sure of the quantity of the vowel. *-inne* is also used only once 150,25 *sinne:küneginne*. Walther has 38,37 *sin:künegin*, 41,1 *künegin:sin*, 4,38 *küneginne:inne*, 118,27 *sinne:küniginne*. The same word is repeated here in all four examples. Walther, too, was very careful not to bind different quantities of vowels. RvZ has 22,1 *künigin:sunneschin* 71,10 *gebietærin: hin in* only two examples in genuine stanzas (also 234,3 *gewin:suenærin*, 237,1 *sin(inf.):widerbringærin*, 287,1 *künigin:din*, 288,10 *künigin:schin*, 296,10 *widerbringerin:mîn*). L,59 *sinne:küniginne*, L,137 *minne:toetærinne*, 5,7 *râtgebinne:küniginne*. 26,9 *sinne: gebietærinne*, 217,7 *minne:küniginne*. (Also 237,9 *sinne:küniginne*, 270,11 *gewinne:sinneroubaerinne*, 274,1 *meisterinne:minne*, 314,3 *keiserinne:minne*. 22,1 speaks for certain *in* but not so sure is 71,10 as we just observed. The examples of adv. *in* and feminine suffix *-in* show us each of these words rimed once with certain long *in* while once they are rimed together. In spite of R's rimes between long and short *in* which, in the genuine stanzas at least, do not involve either of the two words in question, we can claim as RvZ's forms adv. *in* and fem. suffix *in* alongside of *-inne*.

There is variation in the use of the adj. suffix *-lich* and *gelich*. Many writers who use only *-lich*, or *-lich* alongside of *lich* in the adj. suffix, do not shorten the *i* in *gelich*, so for example Hartmann. A summary of the facts as established by Zwierzina (Z.f.d.A. 45,89.) is:- Hartm. from Iw. 3200 on, Rud.v.Ems and a number of others, chiefly Alem. and Rhinefranc. authors, use *-lich* without a companion form. Fleck and Konrad v. Würzburg use regularly *-lich*, seldom *-lich*. A number of Bavarian and East Franconian writers but also Gottfried use *-lich* without any companion form. Wolfr., Wirnt and others have regularly *-lich* seldom *-lich*. Hartm. (except in Iwein), Nibl. and others use *-lich* and *-lich* indiscriminately. RvH was evidently not sure whether he should rime *-lich* as long or short for he avoids it altogether. Walther's usage is cited in Z.f.d.A. 45,88 and shows fluctuations between *-lich* and *-lich*. RvZ's examples except 181,1 *wunderlich:gelich*, are all given by Roethe (387 f.) and show both forms. *rich* is the only rime whereby the long form is attested but that is not convincing because for *rich* itself with long *i* there is no rime except *gelich:rich* which is used twice. *gelich*, however, rimes twice with certain short *i* and *rich* also rimes twice with certain short *i*, while neither rime with certain long *i*. The indications for *rich* are stronger than those for *rich*, and only on its riming with *rich* can we claim for RvZ the form *-lich*. *-lich*, therefore, seems more probable than *-lich*. Roethe does not consider *rich* as attested (s.Roethe p.388) and indeed we must not press these facts too hard for conclusions, as we find Walther's *rich* joined twice with short *i*, and otherwise only with *-lich* or *gelich*. Examples in doubtful stanzas of RvZ: (250,4 *gelich:sich*, 293,1 *wirdeclich:himmelrich*, 302a,4 *glic:rich*).

For the adverbial suffixes *-liche*, *-lichen*, we likewise find a variation in usage. Hartm. has (Greg.1, Iw.4) *-lichen* but no *-liche* Konrad v. Würzburg has *-lichen*, *-liche* and alongside of these though seldom, *-lichen*. Only sporadic examples of *-liche*, *-lichen* occur elsewhere than in Hartm. and Konr. Hartmann has also *-liche* and *-lichen*, especially in his earlier works. Some writers have only *-lichen* but no *-liche*; others have *-liche* but no *lichen*. RvH's lone example is 200,3 *gelichen:gemellichen*. Walther has both *liche* and *-lichen* (Z.f.d.A. 45,93.), though the *-liche* adv. are more numerous. (Z.f.d.A. 45,95) *-liche* occurs in 12,8. 13,12. 17,6. 21,1. 40,2. 45,7. 52,12. 70,22. 77,36. 108,3. 120,30. *-lichen* in 21,20. 26,23. 113,4. No *-liche* or *-lichen* are to be found. RvZ compares with Walther in this respect. He also wavers between *-liche* and *-lichen* but the proportion is only 5 : 3. *-liche* is found in 61,7. 110,9. 136,9. 143,9. 150,7 (Ms. D. has *-lich*), (245,9. 270,1. 316,3). *-lichen* 32,7. 80,9. 191,9. (255,3. 256,4. 317,3.)

Wolfram uses *sit* in the first half of Parzival and *sider* in the second half and in Wh. Hartm. uses only *sit*. gFrau has no *sider*

but uses *sint* alongside of *sît*. *sint* appears in almost all "Heldensagen". Walther uses *sît* twice—9,22 *strît:sît* 119,23 *sît:lît*. All of his nine *sint* are 3rd pl. pres. -ider rimes once but not *sider*. RvH and RvZ have neither *sît*, *sider* nor *sint*.

gên and *stên*, *gêt* and *stêt* were Wolfram's forms, also those of his Bavarian dialect. He would not have left several hundred opportunities to rime -ân, -ât unused if he had been at all accustomed to *gân*, *gât*. Similarly he used *gênt*, *stênt*, and not *gânt*, *stânt*.

RvH rimes *gân* 169,22. 175,5. 188,32. 197,1. 197,13; *begân* 171,33; *ergân* 187,39; *vergân* 152,16; *zergân* 157,17. 183,7. 196,24. 203,21; *stân* 157,17. 176,39. 183,33; *bestân* 182,1; *entstân* 155,20; *widerstân* 184,17; *gât* 150,10. 158,2. 169,19. 170,26. 173,31. 174,25. 179,22. 188,5. 191,8. 195,29. 196,30; *begât* 162,5; *ergât* 172,30. 181,7. 190,17; *vergât* 157,27. 190,23; *zergât* 168,34. 203,17; *stât* 152,1. 158,11. 173,31. 179,13. 179,22. 191,12. 192,1. 193, 1. (which differs from Vogt's note to M.F. 183,13.) *bestât* 153,24. 181,5; *verstât* 162,5. 172,30. Over against all these examples stands 183,13 *geschên* : *ergên* which Haupt declared impossible for RvH. He wished to replace the rime by *getân* : *ergân* to which Paul (P.B.B.2,512) objected. Vogt agrees with Haupt in calling *geschên* impossible and sees no other alternative but to call the stanza spurious. 161,22 *bestên* : *vergên* is not convincing for the *ê* form as it is a neutral rime. Both *bestân* and *vergân* are found rimed to certain *â*. Also Ms. E has *vergân* in 161,25. In 164,19 the "Waise" is *gên* for which Mss. b, C have *gân*. The *gân*, *stân* forms are all infinitives except 203,21 *sô ist mîn trûren gar zergân*, 155,21f. *swie lûtzet ich der triuwen Mich anderhalb entstân*, 182,2f. *doch fürhte ich ir betrogenheit, Daz si mich dicke noch bestân* (3 pl. subj.).

RvH's *gê*, *stê* forms which are all subj. are *gê* 172,24; *begê* 196,36; *ergê* 155,36. 190,19; *vergê* 173,34; *zergê* 176,7; *stê* 176,7. 179,3; *bestê* 162,34. 163,5. 174,18; *gestê* 173,34. 191,4. 195,34; *verstê* 163,18.

For Walther we have *gân*, *stân*, *gât*, *stât* as his forms. *gân* 30,3. 65,33. 66,33. 91,1. 102,17; *begân* 114,9; *engân* 77,7; *ergân* 52,3. 111,2; *zergân* 14,10. 53,2. 71,35; *stân* 30,3. 35,24. 102,17; *verstân* 42,4. 57,8. 71,27. 123,2; *gât* 17,3. 31,19. 46,12. 58,9. 65,14. 70,2. 83,14. 103,3. 104,9. 111,18. 115,23; *ergât* 53,13. 98,8; *zergât* 9,10. 48,16. 64,13. 74,29. 78,7. 83,35. 92,38. 97,14. 103,3. 111,3. 113,16. 116,25. 119,11. 121,15. 122,34. 124,24; *bestât* 98,38. 104,9. 116,33; *gestât* 91,36; *missesât* 59,28; *verstât* 22,21. Over against these examples we have 24,18 *stên* : *gên*; 96,9 *begên* :

verstên; 96,6 *gêt* : *verstêt*; 21,10 *stêst* : *begêst*—all of them neutral and not convincing for the *ê* form.

For RvZ we likewise have *gân*, *stân*, *gât*, *stât* and not *gên*, *stên* etc. *gân* 64,1. 83,3. 146,3. 181,3. (248,10. 291,10. 295,4); *ergân* (273,3); *stân* 25,4(1st sing. pres. ind.), 171,10; *bestân* (244,4. 292,3); *gestân* 83,3. 146,3. 303,7; *understân* 64,1; *gât* 39,3. 118,1. 144,3. 148,1. 186,4. 207,3. (233,1. 268,3. 295,3. 302,4); *begât* 163,1. 176,10; *zergât* 190,3. *stât* L,232. 9,1. 11,3. 29,4. 39,3. 40,1. 109,4. 140,10. 148,1. 164,1. 186,4. (240,1. 268,3. 295,3. 295,10); *gestât* 12,3. 166,3. 182,1; *widerstât* 66,10 (302,3). *gânt* and *stânt* rime together (268,7.); *begânt* is used 231,3. The evidence for *gân*, *stân* is not very strong for on close examination the examples show that three times *gân* and *stân* are joined in neutral rime and once *stân* is 1st pers. sing. This leaves only one example each for certain *gân* and *stân* in genuine stanzas though *gân* in 248,10 *ergân* in 273,3 and *bestân* 244,4 are in stanzas which Roethe believes to be genuine. Nevertheless we have no examples of *ê* forms. It seems as if Reinmar were in doubt in his earlier stanzas and therefore rimed *gân* and *stân* only together but later decided on the *â* forms. The *â* forms for *gât* and *stât* are much more certain. *gât* and *stât* rime together 39,3. 148,1. 186,4.(295,3) but there are numerous other convincing examples especially for *stât*. The doubt seems to have prevailed only for the infinitive form. No *ê* forms appear.

Hartmann has *er gît*, *er lît*, *dû gîst*, *dû lîst* and no double forms alongside of these. The form of the 2nd pl. on the other hand is *liget*, never *lît*. (*lît* < *ligit*) (*liget* < *liget*). Perhaps in Wolfram's dialect there existed the form *er gît* but his rimes show that *er liget* and not *er lît* was the form for the second word in question. For RvH *lît* and *gît*, both without double forms, are attested. The 2nd pl. nowhere occurs. 167,37. 195,26 *zît* rimes with *lît*, 187,33 *lît* : *nît*, 191,26. 197,23. 201,20 *zît* : *gît*, 191,30 *lît* : *strît*, 196,23 *sumerzît* : *lît*, 203,18 *lît* : *zît* (and 182,18 *lîp* : *zît*). Only once do we find *pflîht* 195,5 *iht* : *er pflîht*.

Zwierzina has already pointed out (Z.f.d.A. 44,399) that Walther belongs to the group that use both *er lît* and *er liget*. The examples for *liget* are indicated. The ten for *lît* according to Hornig (Zwierzina says eleven) are 13,27. 27,31. 56,11. 95,17. 123,7 *zît* : *lît*; 14,34. 86,3. 119,23 *sît* : *lît*; 39,9 *strît* : *lît*; 117,36 *lît* : *winterzît*. For *gît* we have three examples 101,6 *zît* : *gît*, 107,6 *strît* : *gît*, 123,2 *gît* : *nît*, and once 72,9 *lebt* : *gebt*. One of the two *liget* rimes is 42,24 *pfliget* : *liget*—a neutral rime, but we must remember that *pflîst*, *pflît* alongside of *ligst*, *lît* is found in only a few MG and HG writers and is a sign of "Rhenish" coloring (Z.f.d.A. 45,405), and would be quite impossible for Walther. RvZ also uses *liget* alongside of *lît* but only *gît*. This *gît* might be literary rime according to Zwierzina's remarks (Beob. 471)

regarding the numerous *git* rimes found in Wolfram's Parzival. The examples are 17,10 *git:lit*; 49,3 *nit:git*, 91,10 *zit:git*; 152,1 *ravit:git*; 206,3 *lit:strit*; (310,7 *lit:engit*.). The examples for *liget* are not found in the earliest stanzas but one is in the "Sammlung" and the other without—154,3 *wigt:ligt*; 185,1 *geligt:gesigt*. (250,10 *enwigt:ligt*; 304,7 *pflight:ligt*). In the line 185,1 *lit* and *geligt* are used side by side—*sô wac gelit sô wint geligt*.

Hartmann has *seist*, *er seit*, *seite*, *geseit* which forms never appear in Wolfram. Alongside of these Hartmann also has *saget*, *er saget*, *sagte*, *gesaget*. In the case of Hartmann's *er treit*, *er leit* etc., we never find the double forms *er traget*, *er leget*, *er legte* or *gelegt*. Wolfram's forms were *tregt*, *legt* (Beob. 472).

For RvH we have already observed 165,37 *geleit*; 174,10 *geseit*, 184,15. 191,31 *seit*. Alongside of *seit* we find no *saget* but the p.p. *gesaget* occurs 152,11. 193,19. Beside his *klaget* 185,10. 193,19; *geklaget* 152,11. 194,11. 198,29 we find no *kleit*, *gekleit*. No *-ege* forms are to be found except 152,24 *pflügen* : *gelêgen*. For Walther we have no *seit* but *saget* 44,3. 78,32. 80,11. We have *geseit* 25,19. 26,20. 29,8. 29,32 and also *gesaget* 3,27. *treit* is used 29,32. 116,26 but no *traget*; *gekleit* 25,19. 26,20; also *geklaget* 45,6. 63,11. *leit* 24,15; *geleit* 26,20. 29,32. 97,13 have no double forms.

In stanza 340,6 which Roethe is inclined to consider genuine, RvZ rimes *bejaget:saget*. *seit* is used in 24,3. 80,1. 131,10. (283,3. 285,1.); *seite* (289,7. considered genuine by Roethe); *geseit* 2,3. 186,10. (296,10). The one uncontracted form in a doubtful stanza will hardly throw any doubt on the statement that *seit*, *geseit* were RvZ's forms. In 17,1 we have *verclagt* : *magt* and 131,10. *seit* : *gecleit*. *magt* : *betagt* rimes 21,4. 226,1. (289,1.). The one example of the contracted form is found in a doubtful stanza (239,4 *meit* : *beteit*). The indications are that RvZ's forms were *seit*, *geseit*, *leit* etc. *treit* etc. but *klaget*, *traget*. Definite conclusions, however, can hardly be drawn from the limited material at hand.

Of weak verbs ending in *-enden*, Wolfram preferred the participial form which ends in *-endet* to the one ending in *-ant*. *gesant* is found alongside of *gesendet* and *gewant* alongside of *gewendet* in proportions of 56:4, 11:3, but because of the greater possibility of riming *-ant* and because most of the examples are in places that show literary rimes, we must still claim for Wolfram a preference for the forms in *-endet*. Keeping in mind this fact we must assign to RvH's four examples in *-endet*, over against which forms in *-ant* are altogether lacking, considerable importance. The examples follow—160,12 *gewendet:verendet*; 171,3 *gewent:gesent*; 199,27 *gewent:sent*. RvH, then, used only the past participle in *-endet* of weak verbs ending in *-enden*. In the same way we must regard Walther's proportion of 3:5 for *-ant* vs. *-endet*

participles as much more significant than a majority of two, for of the thirty-eight *-ant* rime words only three are past participles, whereas nine of the twelve rime words in *-endet* are past participles. The examples are 26,17 *brant : geschant*; 34,21 *hant : gesant*; 76,37 *lant:gepfant*; 34,14 *gesendet:ir pfendet*; 84,33 *gesendet:erblendet*; 84,36 *gewendet:geschendet*; 105,1 *verendet:erwendet*; 110,20 *gewendet:volendet*. Walther's form was *-endet* though we find *-ant* forms alongside of this. Whether these are literary rimes or not is hard to say. In stanza 34,14 ff. we have *gesendet* used alongside of *gesant*. RvZ furnishes too few examples to attempt any conclusion unless it were that he was not sure which to use and therefore avoided both. He has 55,3 *gewant:hant*. Also 211,7 *erblendet:schendet*.

Rimes between different consonants are scarce in RvH but more frequent than impure rimes of vowels of which there is only one if we reject 189,9 *lân:an* as in a spurious stanza (See above). In 160,3 *nan(nam)* rimes with *man* and 191,18 *kan:bekan (bekam)*. *p* and *t* are rimed together 103,20 *wîp:lît* and 182,18 *lît:gît*, which Paul and Bartsch claim for Reinmar but Schmidt (p.58), Burdach (p.220) and Becker (Germ. 22,199) assign to Rugge. 155,21 *triuwon:fröiden*.

A single example for Walther is 72,21 *endelos:trast*. Wackernagel surmised a form *endelôst* which would avoid this singular rime. The only certain rimes between different consonants in RvZ are in the Leich, 68 *jehen:stegen* and 25 ff. *gar:hart, wart:dar:var* with apokope of the *t*, which does not occur elsewhere (318,4 *bescheidenheite:hab bereite*). 172,9 Mss. C, D have *gezimber* though Roethe writes *gezimmer:nimmer* making the rime pure. In a doubtful stanza 286,3 we have *an:nam*. Once more the Leich stands alone in its usage.

Two forms are possible for the preterite of the verbs *nennen*, *kennen*, *rennen*, those with *d* and those with *t*. Hartmann uses *nande*, *kande*, *rande* exclusively (Beobachtungen 482). For the preterite of *wenden* and *lenden* his forms are *wante*, *lante* exclusively. For *senden* it is both *sande* and *sante*. RvH nowhere uses any of these forms. Once he rimes the past participle 173,14 *erkant:zehant*. None of Walther's rimes of preterite forms show certain *t*. *erkande* is certain from the rimes 82,4 *erkande:setze ze pfande*; 83,36 *schande (noun): erkande*; 110,13 *erkande:wande*. The stanza beginning 108,6 is quite doubtful but 108,7 *nande: erkande* is another example. The *d* form for *schanden* is attested by 15,34 *geschande:lande*. *sande* occurs only once and in the stanza beginning 16,1 which may also be spurious. 30,32 we have *entrande:gewande*. We have no positive evidence of *-t-* forms and

reference has already been made to Walther's preference for participial forms in *-endet*.

RvZ uses the *d* form in the third plural of the subjunctive, 54,7 *erkanden:wanden*; and in 178,9 *ich rande:ze lande*. The first is a neutral rime and the second involves the stereotyped form *ze lande* (Beob.483). These rimes seem to strengthen the probability that R. purposely avoided riming these uncertain and double forms (S. p.p. *-ant*, *-endet* above).

Hartmann uses in Er. *ersat* (p.p.) and also several times *ersetzet*. Wolfram and most of Hartmann's contemporaries do not know the form *ersat*. In Iw. Hartmann avoids both forms, probably because he could not decide which of the two to make his own. RvH has neither but it must be remembered that he has six *-at* rimes and no *-etzet*. None of Walther's twelve *-at* rime pairs contain *-sat*. Once he rimes the infinitive *setzen* 37,14 but not the p.p. RvZ has 146,9 *gesetzet:ergetzet*, 138,7 *wetzet:entsetzet*, the only two rimes in *-etzet*. *-sat* does not occur in the four *-at* rimes nor in the doubtful stanzas.

Hartmann's form *gecleit* for *gecleidet* which is used in his earlier works disappears from the position in rime in the later epics. Zwierzina has shown (Beob. 485) that also the fuller form disappears. Not only *gecleit—gecleidet* but also *gespreit—gespreitet*, *gebreit—gebreitet* were such double forms. RvH uses *bereit* for *bereitet* in 184,14 *miniu leit:bereit*—rimed with certain *-eit*. His twenty-five *-eit* rimepairs show no other examples. Walther has forty-five possibilities but no examples. He uses the fuller form in 12,2 *erbeitet:verleitet*; 33,1 *verleitet:beitet*; 47,11 *beitet:verleitet*. As these are the only rimes in *-eitet* the absence of the short form among the *-eit* rimes indicates avoidance or even ignorance of the *-eit* form. RvZ, on the other hand, uses the full form 155,9 *gecleidet:gevreidet* and once in a doubtful stanza (318,4 *bescheidenheite:bereite(t)*) along with the shortened form 110,3 *hat bereit:immer werndiu leit*, and twice in doubtful stanzas (232,1 *meit:bereit*; 236,4 *vorbedachtikeit:bereit*). There are thirty-three *-eit* rime pairs (nine in doubtful stanzas).

Some MHG writers use the gen. and dat. sing. of fem. *-i* stems in the monosyllabic form; others use the two-syllable form with inflectional endings. Wolfram seems to use either unmethodically, whereas Hartmann prefers the monosyllabic forms in his earlier works and uses them almost exclusively in Iwein. RvH's examples are limited but all monosyllabic—159,7. 194,27 *stat*, 170,30 *missetât*, 158,35. 164,2. 171,5. 178,37. 201,37 *arebeit*, 162,16 *kündekeit*, 184,29 *frist*, 168,19. 197,15 *nôt*, 162,25 *jugent*, 154,5. 155,3. 167,37. 188,19. 195,25. 197,23 *zit*. Walther's examples show both the

monosyllabic and the two-syllable forms, and in the case of two words *arebeit*, *hant*, we find both used—4,18. 5,31 *art*, 54,25 *stat*, 93,17 *missetât*, 66,34. 72,38. 117,17 *arebeit*, 9,38 *kristenheit*, 43,10. 53,17 *werdekeit*, 67,34 *staetekeit*, 73,36 *frûmekeit*, 78,19. 123,31 *frist*, 9,26. 15,21. 54,7. 73,15. 86,32 *nôt*, 60,28. 93,36. 107,30 *tugent*, 107,34 *jugent*, 19,26 *hant*, 13,27. 27,31. 69,16. 74,10. 95,17. 107,4. 120,13 *zît*. The two syllable forms are 103,25 *von sîner arebeite*, 78,4 *mit dîner zesewen hende*, 78,27 *in sîner hende*, 31,9 *an ir getaete*, 63,20 *in einer waete*.

Hartmann like Walther uses *hant* alongside of *hende* and *wât* alongside of *waete*, but his *tât* is always monosyllabic also his *arebeit*. RvZ has more numerous examples and his usage corresponds to Wolfram's in its variation between one and two syllable forms—55,3. (246,1. 261,3) *hant*, 41,10 *art*, 8,10. 119,3 (250a,3. 328,7) *stat*, 35,1. 58,4. 199,3. 200,10 *tât*, 45,10. 209,4 (245,4. 251,1) *missetât*, 101,10 *nât*, 132,10 *wât*, but (273,10 *von also minneclîcher taete*) 143,7 *in menschlicher waete*. 2,4. 105,10. 139,3. 143,3 *craft*, 105,10. 158,10. 170,3 nouns in *-schaft*, but 9,7 *mit lewen crefte: mit meistershefte*, 7,4. 141,1. 155,10. 208,3. 213,4 nouns in *-heit*, 19,1. 34,1. 35,10. 123,1. 147,1. 218,1. (236,4. 311,7) nouns in *-keit*, but 9,9 *von der goteheite*, 214,7 *der edeln Cristenheite*, (262,10 *zer hûbescheite*, 318,4 *der bescheidenheite*), 122,9. 124,9 *mit kundikeite* (289,7 *gedenk auch an die grossen heilikeite*, should probably read *gedenk al der grossen heilikeite*, as Roethe suggests. Roethe thinks the stanza may be genuine). (278,3) *list*, L,158. 190,1 *vrist*, 91,10. 214,3. (321,7) *zît*, L,166. 60,10. 126,4 *diet*, 3,4. 106,3 (302,10) *rist*, 5,1. 199,10 *jugent: tugent*, but (231,9 *aller dîner tugende*) 115,4 *ungeniht*, 136,4. 211,10 *zuht*, 136,4 *vruht*, 85,7 *in der vlûete*, (260,10 *in groser aremûete*, 280,4 *bî der glûete*, 334,6 *in viures glûete*). In genuine stanzas we find two-syllable forms of *-heit*, *-keit*, *waete*, *vlûete*.

It has already been admitted that RvZ's *Leich* is too brief to permit far-reaching conclusions. Stanzas 1-229 contain 2748 verses, twelve times as many as are contained in the *Leich*. Yet it's very brevity increases the importance of the points in which it differs from the rest of R's genuine stanzas. These differences are sufficient to cause doubt as to the authenticity of the *Leich* which has always been accepted as genuine.

ich and *sie* are two personal pronouns avoided in rime by RvZ yet both are used once in the *Leich*.

gar rimed with long *a* is a very unusual rime and is of course absent in RvZ, but we find it in the *Leich*.

Impure rimes between different consonants are avoided in the 229 genuine stanzas. L,68 *jêhen:stêgen* stands altogether alone. L,25ff. *gar:hart*, *wart:dar:var* also finds no companion anywhere in the genuine stanzas of RvZ.

The old worn out epithet *dëgen* which RvZ avoids in the genuine stanzas is found in the Leich, and applied to Christ at that.

The commonest rimes in RvZ are those of *man* and *kan*, *lîp* and *wîp*. *Man* rimes no less than 56 times, *kan* 33 times. The rime *wîp:lîp* occurs 24 times in genuine stanzas, *vil:wîl:spil* rime together 23 times. Not one of these rimes can be found in the Leich. Differences in dates of composition, or willful avoidance of these rimes, almost tiring in their frequency, will not suffice as reasons for the above facts, for of the 35 rimes of *hât* 3 are found in the Leich. It is really doubtful that RvZ himself composed the Leich.

Three examples have appeared in the foregoing which ought to be recalled in conclusion here. They are 59,7 *herre:merre*, 60,9 *durnehten:gerëhten*, 62,10 *uf:huf*. All of these are close together in the group of stanzas spoken of as "Herrensprüche" (56-70) and assigned by Roethe to RvZ's courtly period i.e. the Austrian. Of these, stanzas 57-61 and 64 set forth R's relations to Friederich der Streitbare, a fact which fixes them more surely as Austrian in origin. The three rimes, however, are MG rimes and an explanation must be sought how they came to be in Austr. stanzas.

There is little reason to doubt that RvZ left his home by the Rhine and came to Vienna when he was a boy. He grew up in Austria and learned to sing under the great master, Walther, himself. No traces of his home dialect appear in his earliest stanzas, claims Roethe, and it is only natural that he, a mere boy, should learn to use the Austr. dialect perfectly and should lose completely any traces of Rhinefrancian. Anyone has occasion to observe how readily and unconsciously children acquire a new language—at least as far as fine oral distinctions are concerned. Austr. characteristics in the MG stanzas, of which there are a few, are much easier to explain than MG in the Austr. When RvZ left Vienna he was already about thirty-five years old and had acquired some reputation as a poet. Under these circumstances it would not be strange if the earliest MG stanzas showed traces of the Austr. dialect (e.g. 18,1 *hêr:gêr*), but why should the Austr. stanzas show MG rimes? Did Roethe err in assigning the Herrenstrophen to the Austr. period? That is quite improbable and would cause us to question his other assignments made on similar evidence.

The collection of RvZ's poems made by the author in 1241 was in all probability made for somebody and at that time in R's life it can only have been a MG somebody. Contrary to Roethe's assumption (p.110) that the poems of earlier days were incorporated into the collection quite as they originally read and that R. had done little if any correcting, it appears that several more than minor changes were undertaken to suit new conditions of dialect. In other words, RvZ not only gathered his productions into a

collected edition, but also revised his poems dating from the Austr. period.

RvZ began writing about 1220 and left Austria in 1234. Up to the end of his stay in Bohemia he had been writing some twenty years. Ten of these fall in the reign of Duke Leopold VII at the beginning of his career when he was young and enthusiastic, when he was in high favor at the court—his most productive years we would suppose. Four years he spent under Friederich der Streitbare, the last of which were disheartening, but hardly worse for literary production than the whole period of six or seven years spent at Prague. But Roethe can place only about 67 of the 157 stanzas in the collection in the Austrian period i.e. considerably less than half. That a large number of the earliest poems are omitted from the collection and more of the later period present is due not only to the difference in subject-matter as Roethe thinks, but equally to the different dialect in which they were composed. Stanzas 1-157 of Roethe's edition are then a collection of Reinmar von Zweter's poems made by the author himself not earlier than 1241, from which he excluded some stanzas of the Austrian period and included others only after they had been revised.



VITA.

I, Louis E. Wolferz, was born in New York City on July 8, 1886, and received my education in its public schools, later attending Columbia College, New York. which institution conferred on me the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1908. After five years of practical experience as a teacher I spent one semester at Munich University and three very profitable semesters under Professor Philipp Strauch at Halle University, Germany, returning to Cornell University, Ithica, New York, in September 1915, where I was able to complete my work as Jacob H. Schiff, Fellow in German under the kind direction of Professors Pope, Faust and Comfort. For their aid and suggestions I wish hereby to express my thanks.

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

46583.44.5
The rime technique in the poems of
Widener Library 003811073



3 2044 087 136 123